THE STRUCTURE
OF THE
ASHTADHYAYI

By

I S Pawate, M A , LL B

The Shridhar Ramakrishna Bhandarkar

Prizeman in Vyakarana (1934), of the

University of Bombay

PRICE Rs 2/-

To

My Father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author has great pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to Dr S. K. Belvalkar M.A., Ph.D., for the uniform encouragement he received from him while he was working on the Thesis at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Thanks are also due to the members on the staff of the B. O. R. Institute for extending to the author every facility for study.

The author is highly obliged to Mr V. Y. Jather, B. Sc., of the Karnatak Printing Works, for the neat and prompt execution of the work.

The Author

INTRODUCTION

The reader will see that throughout my essay on the Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, I have mainly relied on the Kās'ikā and the Nyāsa, a commentary on the former. The importance of the Kas'ikā cannot be over rated It is the only exhaustive, lucid, scientific, authoritative and ancient commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī The Kās'ikā is generally supposed to have been written in the seventh century A D. But I think that the Kās'ikā cannot have been written later than the second century of the Christian era.

I

To determine the date of the Kās'ikā scholars have up till now relied mainly upon Itsing's account. But, in this connection, it is to be noted that

1. Itsing speaks of a 'Vṛttisūtra'. This Vṛttisūtra has been turned by some scholars into 'Sūtravṛtti', which has been conjecturally identified with the Kās'ikā.

2. Itsing says that the Vṛttisūtra teaches about the laws of the universe This description does not at all apply to the Kās'ikā.

3 Itsing mentions one Jayāditya as the author of the Vṛttisūtra Now the Kās'ikā is the work of two joint authors Vāmana and Jayāditya. Why is Itsing silent about Vāmana, if he meant the Kās'ikā by the word 'Vṛttisūtra'?

4 Itsing says that Patanjali wrote a commentary on the Vṛttisūtra. It is evident that the Vṛttisūtra commented upon by Patanjali can by no stretch of imagination be identified with the Kās'ikā It is interesting to note that Patanjali

speaks of a 'Vrttisūtra' in his Bhāṣya, on वार्तिक 24 (तुल्याख्यानेषु च) on S. II. i. 1 (समर्थः पदविधिः). Patanjali says: न ब्रूमो वृत्तिसूत्रवचनप्रामाण्यादिति । किं तर्हि वार्तिकवचनप्रामाण्यादिति ।.*

Thus we may say, with Dr Belvalkar, that Itsing's account may (does) not after all refer to the Kās'ikā.

II

THE JAINENDRA VYĀKARAṆA AND THE KĀS'IKĀ

Dr K. B.Pathak says (Ind. Antiquary 43 p. 210) that the authors of the Kās'ikā knew the Jainendra Sūtra 'हस्तादेयेऽनुपस्तेये चेः' II iii, 36. He has based his conclusion on the Kās'ikā on P III iii. 40

हस्तादाने चेरस्तेये ।

Kās'ikā :— हस्तादाने गम्यमाने चिनोतेर्धातोः घञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । न चेत्स्तेयं चौर्यं भवति ।. ...उच्चयस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ॥

It is contended that the authors of the Kās'ikā refer to the Jainendrasūtra 'हस्तादेयेऽनुदि अस्तेये चेः' in the sentence 'उच्चयस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः.' But it is also possible that the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa himself based his sutra on the sentence of the Kās'ikā—उच्चयस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ।

Let us turn to the Kās'ikā on P. V iii 101 & 102.

वस्तेर्ढञ् ॥ 101

Kasika:— इवेत्यनुवर्तते . ...। वस्तिशब्दादिवार्थे ढञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । वस्तिरिव वास्तेयः वास्तेयी ।.

शिलाया ढः ॥ 102.

Kās'ikā :—शिलाशब्दादिवार्थे ढः प्रत्ययो भवति । शिलेव शिलेयं दधि । केचिदत्र ढञमपीच्छन्ति। तदर्थं योगविभागः कर्तव्य । शिलाया ढञ् प्रत्ययो भवति। शैलेयम् ॥ ततो ढः । शिलेयम ॥

* Nirnaya Sagara Edition (1912) Vol. II. p. 345.

The authors of the Kās'ikā propose to break S 102, into two sūtras, शिलायाः and ढः, to provide for the form शैलेयम्, because केचिदत्र ढञमपीच्छन्ति. Thus the authors of the Kās'ikā propose to read the present sūtras वस्तेर्ढञ् and शिलाया ढः as follows :—

1. वस्तेर्ढञ् ।
2. शिलायाः [ढञ्]।
3. ढः [शिलायाः] ।

Now, to whom does the Kāsikā refer with the word केचित्, in "केचिदत्र ढञमपीच्छन्ति"? Dr. K B. Pathak thinks that the reference is to the following sutras of Jainendra :—

वस्तेर्ढञ् ॥ IV. I. 207
शिलायाः ॥ 208
ढ श्च ॥ 209

But these Jainendrasūtras seem to have been framed by taking the hint given by the Kāsikā : तदर्थं योगविभागः कर्तव्यः । शिलायाः । ढञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । शैलेयम् । ततो ढः । शिलेयम् ॥.

Then to whom does the Kās'ikā refer in the sentence "केचिदत्र ढञमपीच्छन्ति"? We think the reference is to the Cāndras.

वस्तेर्ढञ् ॥ Cāndra Sūtra IV. iii. 79.
शिलाया ढश्च ॥ 80.

Candra Vritti:— शिलाया इवार्थे वर्तमानाया ढो भवति ढञ् च । शिलेयं दधि । शैलेयम् ॥

It is well known that the authors of the Kās'ikā have extensively drawn upon the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa.*

III

What is the name of the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa? What is the name of the author of the Pāṇinīya?

* "......die Kasika die ja ihrerseits dieses Neue aus Candra meist aufgenommen hat, ohne die Quelle zu nennen......"
Liebich. Vorwort to Candra Vyakarana

Pāṇini, of the Āpis'ala Vyākaraṇa? Āpis'ali, of that of the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa? Candra. So also, what is the name of the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa? Jinendra. जिनेन्द्रेण प्रोक्तं जैनेन्द्रम् । Now the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa is generally known as Devanandin. Thus the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa was known by two names—Jinendra and Devanandin.

IV

The Nyāsa, the earliest extant commentary on the Kās'ikā is by Jinendra Buddhi.

Now let us turn to the Sravanabelgola Inscription No. 64 (1163 A. D) There we read:—

यो देवनन्दिप्रथमाभिधानो बुद्ध्या महत्या स जिनेन्द्रबुद्धिः ।
श्रीपूज्यपादोऽजनि देवताभिर्यत्पूजितं पादयुगं यदीयम् ॥

So Devanandin, Jinendrabuddhi and Pūjyapāda are three names for one and the same person.

Now, Ponna, a great Kannada poet who wrote his ಶಾಂತಿಪುರಾಣ (Śāntipurāṇa) in 933 A. D., speaks of the 'revered Nyāsakāra' as a very lucid commentator,* and invokes the blessings of Pūjyapāda in the beginning of his Śāntipurāṇa † Vṛttavilāsa (1160 A. D.) says that the great ascetic Pūjyapāda « ಭರದಿಂ ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರಮಂ ಭಾಸುರ ಮನಮೊಸೆದಂ ಪಾಣಿನೀಯಕ್ಕೆ ಟೀಕಂ | ಬರೆದಂ »
" wrote the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa and a commentary on the

Pāṇinīya ". Thus it is evident that Devanandin alias Jinendrabuddhi alias Pūjyapāda was the author of the Jainendra Vyakarana and the Nyāsa

In the first edition of the first volume of the Karnataka Kavicharite Mahāmahopādhyāya R. Narasimhacharya placed Pūjyapāda in about 470 A. D. In the revised edition (1924) of the book he places Pūjyapāda in about 600 A D But in his letter to me dated 21-12-1933 he says that Pūjyapāda is to be placed somewhere about 450 A D. And the date seems to be the correct one because, Bana in his Harsacarita written in the reign of Harsavardhana (606-648) refers to the Nyasa in the following passage —

अत्र प्रस्ता बाणस्य चत्वार पितृव्यपुत्रा भ्रातर प्रसवस्तनयो गृहीत वाक्या कृतगुरुपदन्यासा न्यायवादिन सुकृतसंग्रहाभ्यासगुरवा लब्धसाधुशब्दा लोक इव व्याकरणेऽपि ।

If the author of the Nyasa lived about 450 A D, the Kāśikā which was an old work at the time of the author of the Nyasa * must go back to somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era.

The following is the relevent portion of the text of Mahāmahopādhyaya R. Narasimhacharya's kind letter to me

PRAKTANA VIMARSA VICHAKSHANA
KARNATAKA PRACHYA VIDYA VAIBHAVA
Rao Bahadur
R. NARASIMHACHARYA M.A., M.R.A.S.

MALLESWARAM
BANGALORE
2 —12—1933

ಹೇಳಿಕೆ. ಈಚೆಗೆ ರೈಸರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ನಿರಾಧಾರವಾದುದೆಂದೂ ಪೂಜ್ಯಪಾದನಿಗೂ ದುರ್ವಿನೀತನಿಗೂ ಯಾವವಿಧವಾದ ಸಂಬಂಧವೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದೂ ನಾನು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. Indian Antiquary for 1913, P 204 ನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಈತನ ಶಿಷ್ಯನಾದ ವಜ್ರನಂದಿಯ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಮಾಣವು ನಂಬಲರ್ಹವಾದುದೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸಂದೇಹವುಂಟಾಯಿತು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ೨ನೆಯ ಮುದ್ರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿದೆನು. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂಜ್ಯಪಾದನ ಕಾಲವು ೪೫೦ ಆಗಿರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. Indian Antiquary 43, P 211 ನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಠಕರು ಇಂಥ ಕಾಲನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಜ್ರನಂದಿಯ ಕಾಲವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದಿರಬಹುದು

೨. ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರ ವ್ಯಾಕರಣದ ಸೂತ್ರಗಳು ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉದಾಹೃತವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂಬ ನನ್ನ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗೆ ಪಾಠಕರೇ ಆಧಾರ ಅವರು Indian Antiquary 43, P 210ರಲ್ಲಿ "ಹಸ್ತಾದೇಯೇನುದ್ಯಸ್ತೇಯೋ ಚೇಃ" ಎಂಬ ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರಸೂತ್ರವು (II, 3,36) ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಕಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿತ್ತೆಂದೂ; ಅಲ್ಲದೆ "ವಸ್ತ್ರೇರ್ಧಞ್" (IV.1 207) ಶಿಲಾಯಾ (IV, 1, 208), ಢ ಞ (IV, 1, 209) ಎಂಬ ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರದ ಮೂರು ಸೂತ್ರಗಳೂ ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ "ಕೇಶಿದತ್ರಢಞಾಮಪೀಚ್ಛಂತಿ" ಎಂದಾರಂಭಿಸುವ ವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೂದಿತವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ವಿವರವನ್ನು Indian Antiquary ಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಯಬಹುದು.

ಇಂತೀ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನೆ

Sd./ ರಾ. ನರಸಿಂಹಾಚಾರ್ಯ.

To,

I. S PAWATE, Esq B A., LL B
PLEADER, HUBLI.

PART I

पाणिनिना प्रोक्तं पाणिनीयम्

Sanskrit fettered by the grammar of Panini We read this interesting piece of dialogue in the Mahabhasya –

कश्चिद् वैयाकरण आह – कोऽस्य रथस्य प्रवेतेति । सूत आह, अहमायुष्मन्नस्य प्राजितेति । वैयाकरण आह – अपशब्द इति । सूत आह – **प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानां प्रियः । न त्विष्टिज्ञः ।** इष्यत एतद् रूपम् इति । II 1 56,

प्रदीप – प्राजितेति इति । संज्ञामेव प्राप्तिं भवान् जानाति । न त्वाचार्याणाम् इष्टिम् इत्यर्थः ।

We think that a system of grammar the students of which have such ideas about its function and extent of authority, cannot be accused of having checked the natural growth of the language. We should rather say that the Paninian system allowed full growth to the language while it was living and checked its deterioration, when Sanskrit was being slowly thrown into the background by Pali and other vernaculars at the rise of Buddhism.

This system of Panini consists of three interdependent works, viz, the Dhatupatha, the Ganapatha, and Sutrapatha. And we shall consider them in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II.
DHATUPATHA.

What it is - The Dhatupatha is a list of dhatus or roots The various schools of Sanskrit grammar seem to have. had their own separate Dhatupathas. The students of the grammar of Apisali, one of the predecessors of Panini,- the Apisalas had their own Dhatupatha, and Patanjali tells us according to this Dhatupatha the root अस् was simply स् the अ, आ seen in forms like अस्ति and आसीत् being simply augments

As regards the Paninian Dhatupatha we must note at the outset that originally the meanings of roots were not given in Dhatupatha; but were added later by Bhimasena; and that originally there was संहितापाठ of roots and they were not separated from each other.§

It seems that the Paninians themselves had their Dhatupatha in more than one version. The existing Dhatupatha begins with the root भू but Patanjali seems to speak of another version also in which the अदादिs began with the root

---

*गमयप्रविन्य: स्व.। I. iii 22.

वा। आङ: स्न: प्रतिज्ञाने इति वक्तव्यं। वा।

भाष्यं — आङ: स्नः प्रतिज्ञाने इति वक्तव्यं अस्ति सकारमातिष्ठते। आगमौ गुणवृद्धी आतिष्ठते। विकारौ गुणवृद्धी आतिष्ठते। This passage has been incorporated into the Kasika, & the Nyasa commenting thereon says " सकारमस्ति धातुमापिशलिराचार्यं प्रतिजानीते। P 228 Also Padamanjari.

आपिशल्या अस्भुवानीयं धातुं सकारमात्रं प्रतिजानते॥

Quoted in Ns Ed. Mh Bh. Vol II. P 162.

§ Vide Bhashya on वा। परिमाण ग्रहणेन। on S I iii 1 and Kaiyata and Nagesha thereon

वा that is, in which the present भ्वादिs were वादिs, and in which the वादिs and not the भ्वादिs were placed at the beginning of the Dhatupatha.[1] And this will not seem surprising when we remember that the Paninians were a vast school and were divided among themselves according as they were easterners or westerners (cf Kasika VI ii 104). But at present we have only one version of the Paninian Dhatupatha and the other seems to have been irrecoverably lost. From Ksirasvamin to Bhattoji all the commentators comment on one and the same version of the Dhatupatha and that version is the version we have.

Its relation to the Astadhyayi

Now let us turn to the Astadhyayi and consider its relation to the Dhatupatha.

When reading the Siddhanta Kaumudi we are apt to be misled by the place and treatment accorded to the Dhatupatha in it, into thinking that the Dhatupatha is merely an appendix to the Astadhyayi. So Apte in his Dictionary says that the Dhatupatha is supposed to be the work of Panini himself, "*as supplementary to his sutras*

---

[1] भूवादयो धातवः I iii 1

भाष्यम् - प्रत्येकं चादिशब्दः परिसमाप्यते। भूवादय इति वादय इति च। यदा तावत् क्रियावचना धातुरित्येष पक्षः तदा भू इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स व्यवस्थायां वर्तते। वा इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स प्रकारे। भू इत्येवमादयः वा इत्येवंप्रकारा इति। [Refers to the Dh P we have] यदा तु भाववचना धातव इत्येष पक्षः तदा वेत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स व्यवस्थायां वर्तते। भू इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स प्रकारे। वेत्येवमादयो भू इत्येवंप्रकारा इति। [Refers to the lost version of the Dh P]

निवृत्तिर्भविष्यति। न चावश्यं शिष्टप्रयोग उपास्य। येपि पठ्यन्ते तेषामपि विपर्यासनिवृत्त्यर्थं। ङीङ् हि कृष्यर्थं कमि प्रयुञ्जते। दश्यर्थं च दिशि।

Thus the Dha P. is not strictly speaking an appendix to the Astadhyayi, as it contains much matter not necessary for the purposes of the Astadhyayi, Kaiyata tells us that it was meant to be an exhaustive list of all the roots in the Sanskrit language¹

The author of the Dhatupatha.

Who is the author of the Dhatupatha? Most of us would readily answer "Panini, the author of the Astadhyayi". Such is the common belief, that has been current for some centuries. The Bhavisyapurana says,—

> इत्युक्त्वान्तर्दधे रुद्र पाणिनिः स्वगृहं ययौ।
> सूत्रपाठं धातुपाठं गणपाठं तथैव च।
> लिंगसूत्रं तथा कृत्वा परम् निर्वाणमाप्तवान्।

The Siksa speaks of Panini as the author of the whole of the Vyakarana "कृत्स्नं व्याकरणम्" and this whole must evidently include the Dhatupatha. At the end of the existing Dh P we find the colophon इति श्रीपाणिनिमुनिप्रणीतो धातुपाठः समाप्तः। Goldstucker says (p 182) that Panini is the author of the groundwork of the existing Dhatupatha. 'The Dh P' says Kieth, Hist of Sanskrit Lit (1930) p 430, goes back in substance to Panini. And Liebich in 1930, describes the Ksiratarangini on the title page of his edition of that work as "Ksirasvamin's Kommentar zu Paninis Dhatupatha"

We submit this belief is not free from doubts

Cf. भाष्यम्. पाठेन धातुसंज्ञेत्येतदुपपन्नम् भवति।

प्रदीप.— पाठेनेति। ये धातुपाठे पठितास्तेषामेव धातुसंज्ञा। तेषां पाठो नावलक्षणार्थोपितु इयत्तावनिश्चयार्थ। S I. iii 1.

The word *dhatu* itself is we are told by the Kasika, a term borrowed by Panini from his predecessors it was they who gave the name of *dhatu* to the क्रियावचनs or verbs and Panini having borrowed the word from his predecessors uses it in the sense in which it was used by them §

The word *dhatu* is derived from the root धाञ्, by adding the Unadi termination तुन्(172) Yaska says धातुर्दधातेः So the etymological sense of the word is "that which sustains that which underlies Amara describes a *dhatu* as शब्दयोनि *or source of words* Now this description of Amara and the etymological meaning of the word *dhatu* show that the battle between the Nairuktas and the वैयाकरणानां चैके referred to by Yaska in the famous passage of his Nirukta had been decisively won by Sakatayana and the Niruktas, and already Acharyas before Panini seem to have taken the view that the नामानि were आख्यातजानि and so dubbed the क्रियावचनs or verbs as *dhatus*

Before coming to such a momentous conclusion they must have studied the nature of verbs or *akhyatas* thoroughly by collecting them steadily and following each root into all its derivatives to be found in the Sanskrit language For this purpose they must have collected all the available* r o o t s in one place We have seen above that the Dhatupatha is not a mere appendix to the Astd, that *it contains much matter that is useless for the purposes of the Astd* and that it was meant to be an exhaustive list of all the roots in the

§ धातुरिति पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञा । ते च क्रियावचनाः सर्वे कृतवन्तः ।
* तदिदमपि पूर्वाचार्यप्रणयनात् क्रियावचित्वमस्य भूवादीनां धातुसंज्ञा निर्दिष्टा । Ka Ka I iii 1.

Sanskrit language May we suggest that this is due to the fact that the collection of all the क्रियावचन, in one book, that is, the composition of the Dh P was the work of those grammarians who, with Sakatayana, held that all the nouns were derived from verbs, and that the verbs were the primal elements or *dhatus* or sustainers of the whole structure of language? Does it not seem highly probable that the Dhatupatha was meant to serve the purposes not only of the student of grammar, but also those of the student of words on the lines laid down in the Nirukta? If the Dhatupatha is to serve such a double purpose, it is evident that it should contain every root in the language, whether regular or irregular whether strictly necessary for the purposes of a student of grammar or no So we think that the Dhatupatha is the work of Nirukta-*Vaiyakaranas of the type of the great Sakatayana*

Now let us see whether Panini was a grammarian of the type of Sakatayana If he was of that type then it is possible that the Dhatupatha is his work But if it is found that Panini held with Gargya, and the वैयाकरणा चैके referred to by Yaska in his Nirukta that not all the nouns are derived from verbal roots then much of the existing Dhatupatha would become worse than useless for him, and we think he should not be fathered to a work, which was the child of an opponent school of thought.

There is very strong evidence to show that Panini with Gargya held the *avyutpatti* theory of nouns Patanjali commenting on the Vartika —नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकम् on 3 3 1 उणादयो बहुलम्, says वैयाकरणानां च शाकटायन आह धातुजं नामेति. It is significant that Panini also is not mentioned as holding that view And under 7 1 [illegible]

This conclusion is strengthened when we consider the way in which the Astd refers to the Dhatupatha The first distinct reference to the Dhatupatha as a whole occurs in I iii 1&2, भूवादयो धातव & उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत्. The word *upadesa* is to be noted The Astd always refers to the Dh P as a whole with the word *upadesa* As to the exact meaning of the word there has raised a controversy between the प्राचीन s & the नव्य s The Kasika says — उपदिश्यते अनेनेति उपदेश शास्त्रवाक्यानि सूत्रपाठ खिलपाठश्च Nyasa —उपदेश इति करणे घञ् । खिलपाठ। धातुपाठ. And according to the प्राचीनकारिका referred to in the Balmanorama, by the word *upadesa* are meant —

धातुसूत्रगणोणादिवाक्यलिङ्गानुशासनम् । आगमप्रत्ययादेशा

Upadesa, according to the S K is आद्योच्चारणम् * This definition of उपदेश given by the S K seems to have been based upon the dictum of Kaiyata — येन तु स्वरूपज्ञानाय अपूर्वं-मुच्चरणं तिदमेव उपदेशव्यवहार I VI 1 15 अ वेच उपदेशेऽशिति

Leaving alone the *prachinas* and the *arvachinas* to fight amongst themselves, let us turn *from their wordy battle* to the Astd itself and see what the Astd. refers to with the word *upadesa* The word *upadesa* occurs nine times in the Astd and let us consider all these nine cases

1 उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत् । I. iii 2

Here the word *upadesa, includes* the Dhatupatha

2 आदेच उपदेशेऽशिति । VI i 45

The word *upadesa* in this case, refers only to the Dhatupatha

* cf Balam उच्चारणार्थक. स्थिरयोच्चारणक्रियायाम् । भावे घञ् ।

and that the author of the Astd got the Dh P handed down to him as Upadesa from a series of earlier Acharyas

We have seen above that Patanjali speaks of two versions of the Paninian Dhatupatha It is probable that Panini received both the versions from his आचार्यs It is perhaps due to some partiality shown by Panini and Katyayana and Patanjali for the version beginning with the root भू, that it only has come down to us We shall later on show that Panini received from his predecessors the सर्वादिगण in two versions

That there were two versions of the Dh P is supported by the fact that some references to particular गणs by some sutras in the अष्टाध्यायी are not found in the present Dh P For instance, S षिद्भिदादिभ्योऽङ् (III iii 104) refers to the भिदादिगण But there is no भिदादिगण in the present version of the Dh P The Kasika says — (प्रातिपदिक–)गणपठितेषु भिदादिषु निरूप्य प्रकृतया गृह्यन्ते । It is rather strange that the word षित् should refer to the Dh P and the next word भिदादि to the प्रातिपदिकपाठ or the गणपाठ If the reference is to the गणपाठ, the भिदादिभ्य portion of the sutra is useless because the words are mentioned in the गणपाठ along with the प्रत्यय i e in their साधित form We think that the reference is to the भिदादिगण which was to be found in the lost version of the Dhatupatha Similar remarks apply to S III i 134

In the Astd itself there are two kinds of sutras, which support this contention of ours that the author of the Astd is not the author of the Dhatupatha First, sutras that are supplementary to the Dh P and secondly, sutras that go against the Dh P and contradict what has been taught in the

the roots when stripped of their इर्s would have been, ग्लुच् etc. instead of ग्लुचु etc. as required. But this is no great difficulty. It has been overcome in the Dhatupatha itself, by placing उ in the beginning of the root and इर् at its end; cf. उच्छृदिर्, (*Rudhadi*) उतृदिर् (*Rudhadi*) उबुन्दिर्, (*Bhvadi*) Thus by reading उम्रुचिर् etc. for म्रुचु etc. in the Dh. P. the author of the Astd. were he the author of the Dhatupatha also, could have reduced this lengthy sutra to जॄश्विभ्यां च. That the author of the Astd, does not do so, shows that he got the Dh P. well-fixed from his predecessors, and being unable to make any changes in the Dh. P. directly, had recourse to special Astd. sutras, *whenever he wanted to modify the effect* of the Dh. P. on roots. The point will become clearer, when we consider the second kind of supplementary sutras.

(1. b) These are sutras which in effect ascribe a class or gana to a root, in addition to the one to which it already belongs according to the *Dh.P. S.III.1.70 is an example* of this kind of sutras.

वा भ्राशभ्लाशभ्रमुक्रमुक्लमुत्रसित्रुटिलषः ।

Kasika.- उभयत्र विभाषेयम्। टुभ्राशृ टुभ्लाशृ भ्रमु अनवस्थाने भ्रमु चलने। द्वयोरपि ग्रहणम्। क्रमु पादविक्षेपे क्लमु ग्लानौ त्रसी उद्वेगे त्रुटी छेदने लष कान्तौ एतेभ्यो वा श्यन् प्रत्ययो भवति।

Nyasa:- उभयत्र विभाषेयमिति। भ्रमेरनवस्थानार्थस्य क्रमिक्लम्योश्च दैवादिकत्वात् प्राप्ते त्रुटेस्तौदादिकत्वाद् भ्राशप्रभृतीनां भौवादिकत्वाद् अप्राप्ते।

The purpose of this sutra is in effect to assign the roots mentioned therein, to both the Bhvadi and the Divadi classes. According to this sutra, the roots भ्रमु, क्रमु and त्रसी, which ex-

clusively take श्यन् according to the Dh. P. being there mentioned only among the Divadis, take श्यन् optionally; *i. e.* they take both श्यन् and शप् (by S. III. i 68); *i. e.* they are in effect both Bhvadis and Divadis. Of the other roots mentioned in the sutra, त्रुट् occurs in the Dh. P. among the तुदादिs and the remaining among the Bhvadis. Thus the root त्रुट् would take only श as *vikarana* and the remaining roots only शप्, according to the Dh. P. But this sutra lays down that they optionally take श्यन् also. Thus the sutra in effect says that त्रुट्, which according to the Dh P. belongs only to the Tudadi class, ought also to belong to the Divadi class; & that the remaining roots, though only Bhvadis according to the Dh.P. ought to be considered as Divadis also. Now let us suppose that the author of the Astd was also the author of the Dh.P. What would we expect? We would expect him to have dispensed with this sutra, by including the roots mentioned in the sutra, in the Dh. P. in both the ganas to which they belong or ought to belong. Thus he could well have included the roots भ्राश्, भ्लाश्, भ्रम्, क्लम्, लष्, and त्रस् in both the Bhvadis and the Divadis and the root त्रुट् in both the Divadis and the Tudadis. By so doing he could have altogether dispensed with this sutra(3.1.70.). There are many instances in which the same root is mentioned in more than one *ganas* or classes in the Dh.P Thus प्लुष् is included both in the Divadi and the Kryadi classes; युष् अवबोधने in both the Divadi and the Bhvadi classes; वृधि आच्छादने among both the स्वादिs and the चुरादिs; ओविजी भयचलनयोः in both the Tudadis and the Rudhadis, the root धून् कंपने occurs thrice in the Dh. P., in the Swadis, the Kryadis and the Churadis. And the root युष् occurs

in the Dh P four times in four different classes among the Bhvadis the Divadis, the Kryadis and the Churadis, Sayana remarks on this root thus – एक एव धुविर्विकरणभेदाय पुन पठ्यते । Dhatuvritti, Vol II p 388

Now the fact that the author of the Astd does not dispense with the sutra by including the roots mentioned therein in the various *ganas* in the Dh P to which they ought to belong can be explained only on the hypothesis that the author of the Astd was not the author of the Dh P that the author of the Astd got the Dh P from his predecessors as *upadesa* and held it to be something sacred with the text of which he could in no way meddle

Having thus far dealt with the Astd sutras which are supplementary to the Dh P we now proceed to the second kind of sutras referred to above *viz* sutras that contradict what has been taught in the Dh P, sutras that say that a certain root though mentioned in a certain class in the Dh P nevertheless does not at all belong to that class but to an altogether different class S III 1 80 is an instance in point

धिन्विकृण्व्योर च । III 1 80

Kasika — हिवि धिवि जिवि प्रीणनार्था । कृवि हिंसाकरणयो । इत्येतयोर्धात्वोरुप्रत्ययो भवत्यकारश्चान्तादेश । धिनोति कृणोति । अतो लोपस्य स्थानिवद् भावाद्गुणो न भवति ।

Nyasa — भ्वादित्वाच्छपि प्राप्ते वचनम् ।

In the Dh P roots धिवि and कवि occur in the first or the Bhvadi class. And according to VII 1 58 (Iditonum

† Similar remarks apply to sutras III 1 75, 76 & 82

dhatoh) the augment न् comes after the last vowel in the root Thus we get धिन्व् and कृण्व्; and these roots, being according to the Dh P Bhvadis, would give us the forms धिन्वति, धिन्वत, धिन्वन्ति and कृण्वति, कृण्वत, कृण्वन्ति etc But according to the opinion of the author of the Astd expressed in the sutra under consideration the roots are धिव and कृण and take उ as *vikarana* instead of शप् Thus the author of the Astadhyayi is of opinion that the two roots are wrongly classed under the Bhvadis in the Dh P and that they really belong to the Tanadi class

We think this is the strongest piece of internal evidence that could possibly be adduced to show that the author of the Astadhyayi is not the author of the Dh P It also shows that a great deal of time must have intervened between the author of the Dh P and that of the Astadhyayi At the time of the author of the Dh P the roots धिन्व् and कृण्व् were used among the Sistas, with शप् for their *vikarana* but at the time of the author of the Astadhyayi, roots धिन्व् and कृण्व् as belonging to the Bhvadi class were obsolete and the Sistas used them with the *vikarana* उ, *i e* at the time of the author of the Astd the roots were current as Tanadis

The foregoing is sufficient to convince us that the author of the Astadhyayi is not the author of the Dh P But there is another circumstance also which forces upon us the conclusion that the author of the Astd got the Dh P from his predecessors, and held it to be something so sacred that he did not think it proper to make any changes in, or additions to it directly — we mean the occurrence in the Astd

of some roots which are quite unknown to the Dh P These are called सौत्रधातव roots occurring only in the Sutra and not in the Dh P They are eight in number — ऋति, occurring in III i 29 ऊ in III ii 150 तु in VII iii 95 सातिं in III i 138 and स्कम्भु स्तुम्भु स्कुम्भु and स्तुम्भु all in III i 82 of these स्तम्भु occurs in III i 59 also

Now let us turn to the Bhasya on I iii 1 There we read as follows —

भाष्यम् — एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यदादिग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापय त्याचार्य —अस्ति च पाठो बाह्यश्च सूत्रादिति । किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम्। पाठेन धातुसंज्ञेत्येतदुपपन्नं भवति ।

प्रदीप —पाठेनेति । ये धातुपाठे पठितास्तेषामेव धातुसंज्ञा । तेषां पाठो नोपलक्षणार्थोऽपि तु इयत्ताप्रतिपादनार्थं ।

So Patanjali and Kaiyata tell us that all the dhatus in the Sanskrit language are to be found in the Dh P and that what is not to be found there is no *dhatu* Then how can these *sautra* roots be called *dhatus* at all in view of the fact that they do not occur in the Dh P ? Nagoji bhatta overcomes this difficulty by imagining that originally the roots did occur in the Dh P but that in course of time they have slipped out of it * But this is very unlikely nay rather impossible If any thing the *patha* of these roots in the Dh P ought to have been the more firmly fixed because they occurred *both* in the sutra and the Dh P Many out of the way roots that do not occur either in

* पूर्वं धातुपाठे पठितानामिदानीं पाठभ्रंशोऽनुमीयते । M Bh N S Edit Vol II, P 112 b

common literature or in the sutras are *pathita* and not *paribhrasta* in the Dh P Then why should the *patha* of the *sautra* roots be lost ?

We think the non occurrence of the *sautra* roots in the Dh P is to be attributed to the fact that the author of the Astd was not the author of the Dh P, and that though the author of the Astd, came across some roots not mentioned in the Dh P, yet he did not think it proper on his part to insert them into the Dh P, and thus tamper with its text, because the Dh P was something very sacred to him he having received it as *upadesa* from his predecessors

II

External Evidence

1 *Kaiyata* :— But how are we to get over the technical[1] difficulty in calling words like ऋति (occurring in S III i 29) चुलुम्प (occurring in Vart अनेकाल्ग्रहणं चुलुम्पाद्यर्थम्) and the कण्ड्वादिs (occurring in the *kandvadi* gana referred to in S कण्ड्वादिभ्यो यक् III i 27)— how to call these *dhatus* in as much as they do not occur in the Dh P ? Kaiyata answers this question with the words — तत्र ये सूत्रवार्तिकभाष्यगणेषु पठ्यन्ते, तेऽपि सूत्रकारादिप्रामाण्याद् धातुत्वेनाश्रयणीयाः ।

सूत्रकारादिप्रामाण्यात् evidently means सूत्रकार-वार्तिककार-भाष्यकार-गणकाराणां प्रामाण्यात् So Kaiyata says that the roots occurring in the Sutra (Astd), the Vartika the Bhasya, and the Ganapatha, are also to be regarded as *dhatus* because the Sutrakara, the Vartikakara, the Bhasyakara and the Ganakara are all of them authorities (pramanyat) in the matter of

[1] On Bhasya, on I iii 1

dhātus or roots (just like the Dhātupāṭhakāra) Evidently neither the Bhāṣyakāra nor the Vārttikakāra is the author of the Dh P And the Sūtrakāra who is spoken of in the same breath as the Vārttikakāra and the Bhāṣyakāra, must also like the two latter be not the author of the Dh P, according to the rule of सादृश्ये or *ejusdem generis* This shows that the Sūtrakāra was according to Kaiyaṭa, different from the author of the Dh P Otherwise Kaiyaṭa would have spoken of the *sūtra* roots and the Sūtrakāra separately from others, thus - तत्र ये सौत्रा धातवस्तेषामपि धातुत्वम् । सूत्रकारस्य धातुकारादनन्यत्वात् ।

An objection may be raised against this Kaiyaṭa commenting on the Bhāṣya on the Vārt परिमाणग्रहणं च in S I iii 1 says — ततश्च निषेधादावन्दादिप्रसङ्गः । न चार्थपाठः परिच्छेदक । तस्य अपाणिनीयत्वात् । The expression तस्य अपाणिनीयत्वात् indicates that Kaiyaṭa held the अर्थनिर्देश to be अपाणिनीय and the Dh P minus the अर्थनिर्देश to be *Pāṇinīya* But the word 'Pāṇinīya' is ambiguous, meaning both पाणिनिना प्रोक्तम् and पाणिनिना अभ्युपगतम् । And we are told by no less an authority than the author of the Nyāsa, that the word '*Pāṇinīya*', when used with reference to the Dh P, is to be understood in the latter sense *

2 CHANDRA—

In his Vṛtti on S I i 45 of his work Chandra refers to the statement at the end of the Pāṇinian Dh P *viz* पुन्छादिषु धात्वर्थ इत्यत्र सिद्धम्, as the saying of the *Dhātukāra*

* अपाणिनीयमिति । पाणिनेरिदं पाणिनीयम् । न पाणिनीयमपाणिनीयमिति। तेन अनभ्युपगमात । न तु तेन अकृतत्वात । Nyāsa on VII iv 3

नथा चाह वानुमाराऽपि , p 14 Candravrtti And commenting on II 1 95 he says शोभना सूत्रस्य कृतिः पाणिनेः p 114 1. d

3 PATANJALI

The following references to Panini by name occur in the Bhasya —

दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः । VII. 1 27. पाणिने मनन्गस्य । II 11 16 नहि पाणिनिना शब्दा प्रोक्ता । किं तर्हि ? सूत्र । Paspasa कथं पुनरिदं भगवत पाणिनेराचार्यस्य लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् । Ibid शोभना खलु सूत्रस्य कृतिः पाणिनिना । II 1 1 66 सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः । VII 1 27 प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवत पाणिनेः सिद्धम् । VII 1 2 आकुमारं यशः पाणिनेः । I 1v 83 उपसेदिवान् कौत्सः पाणिनिम् । III 11 108

We see that Patanjali speaks of Panini several times in his Bhasya He tells us that Panini was the son of Daksi that he taught the Sutra and so he was the Sutrakara that his way of composing the Sutra was admirable that he held the सर्वपदादेश theory that he held the *avyutpatti* theory of nouns that his fame had spread even unto children and that a descendent of Kutsa came to him as pupil

Now it is very significant that Panini is nowhere in the Bhasya mentioned as the author of the Dh P whereas he has been mentioned several times as the author of the Sutra

The word Paniniya also occurs in the Bhasya It means a student of what has been taught by Panini or simply what has been taught by Panini And what has been taught by Panini ? The sutra

---

1 नहि पाणिनिना शब्दा प्रोक्ता । किं तर्हि ? सूत्रम् । Paspasa

Panini is known as the author of the *Vyakarana* that goes by his name.* Now Katyayana defines *Vyakarana* as लक्ष्यलक्षणे.† What is the *laksya*? The sabda or words as used in the Loka and the Veda. And what is *laksana*? It is the Sutra.‡ Let us now see whether the Dh. P. can be included in either category. It cannot evidently be included in *laksana* which is *sutra*.¶ And moreover *laksana* is described as सामान्यविशेषवत्,§ and this description obviously does dot apply to the Dh. P. Neither can it be included in the *laksya* because roots are used neither in the Loka nor in the Veda by themselves. It may be said that the *laksya* is *sabda* or words and the Dh. P. consists of roots which are *sabda* or words and that therefore we can say that the Dh. P. being a list of words is included in the *Laksya*. But it is to be noted that the words *sabda* and *laksya* are used both in the Bhasya and the Vartika in the sense of words used in the *Loka* and the *Veda* and neither in the *Loka* nor in the *Veda* are bare roots without *pratyayas* used. Therefore the words *sabda* and *laksya* in the Bhasya

---

* येनाक्षरसमाम्नायमधिगम्य महेश्वरात्।
कृत्स्नं व्याकरणं प्रोक्तं तस्मै पाणिनये नमः॥ Sik. 57.

† Vartika — लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम्। Paspasa

‡ किं पुनर्लक्ष्यम्? किं वा लक्षणम्? शब्दो लक्ष्यः। सूत्रं लक्षणम्। Paspasa

¶ Cf. अस्ति च पाठो बाह्यश्च सूत्रात्। (पाठ = धातुपाठ) Bhasya on I. iii. 1

§ कथं तर्हीमे शब्दाः प्रतिपत्तव्याः। किञ्चित् सामान्यविशेषवल्लक्षणं प्रवर्त्यम्। येनाल्पेन यत्नेन महतो महतः शब्दौघान् प्रतिपद्येरन्। किं पुनस्तत्। उत्सर्गापवादौ। कश्चिदुत्सर्गः कर्तव्यः कश्चिदपवादः। Paspasa.

and the Vartika do not include the roots mentioned in the Dh P. Even if it be held that the words *laksya* and *sabda* include the roots mentioned in the Dh P yet we cannot say that Panini is the author of the Dh P Patanajali emphatically says न हि पाणिनिना शब्दा प्रोक्ताः । किं तर्हि [†]सूत्रम् And to judge from his Vartika on VI iii 7 and 8, Katyayana is of opinion that the word *Vyakarana* does not include the Dh P §

In one passage Patanjali refers to the author of the Dh P as the Acharya of both himself and the Sutrakara

स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले । I iii 72.

भाष्यम् – स्वरितञित इति किमर्थम् ? याति वाति द्राति प्साति । स्वरितञित इति शक्यमकर्तुम् । इह कस्मान्न भवति, याति वाति द्राति प्साति इति । कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफल इत्युच्यते सर्वेषां च कर्त्रभिप्रायं क्रियाफलमस्ति । त एवं विज्ञास्याम । यस्य कर्त्रभिप्रायमकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति तस्य आत्मनेपदं भवतीति । न चैषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति । तथाजातीयकाः खल्वाचार्येण स्वरितञितः पठिता य उभयवन्तः । येषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

Here Patanjali maintains that the Sutrakara could have omitted the word स्वरितञित from the sutra, and cites an *Acharya*, in his argument against the use of the word It is evident that the word *Acharya* must refer to

---

Cf धातुवं च्द्‍ । Bhasya on III ii 115

§ वैयाकरणाख्यायां चतुर्थ्याः । VI iii 7

परस्य च । VII iii 8

वार्तिकम् — आत्मनेभाषपरस्मैभाषयोरुपसंख्यानम् ।

प्रदीप — आत्मनेभाषपरस्मैभाषशब्दौ च न केषुचिद् व्याकरणेषु सम्बन्धेन स्थिताविति अस्याशयः ।

a person who stands in the relation of an *Acharya* to both the Sutrakara and Patanjali and in this case he can be none else than the Dhatukara

The point will become clearer when we consider some of the cases in which the Vartikakara is attacked and shown that his Vartika is either not needed or wrong on the ground of *Acharya pravritti*

Under SS I 1 65 & 66 Katyayana attacks the प्रकॢप्तपक्ष with the Vartika –

वा॥ सप्तमीपञ्चम्योश्च भावादुभयत्र षष्ठीप्रकॢप्तिस्तत्रोभयकार्यप्रसंग । वा॥

Patanjali in his turn, attacks Katyayana and his Vartika thus

भाष्यम् यदप्युच्यते—सप्तमीपञ्चम्योश्च भावादुभयत्र षष्ठीप्रकॢप्तिस्तत्रोभयकार्यप्रसङ्ग इति । नैष दोषः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नोभे युगपत्प्रकॢप्ते भवत इति । यदयमेक पूर्वपरयोरिति पूर्वपरग्रहणं करोति ।

Here the Acharya referred to is neither the Vartikakara nor the Bhasyakara but a third person *viz* Panini, who is the Acharya of both Katyayana and Patanjali

Acharya referred to here is neither Patanjali who attacks nor Katyayana, who is attacked but a third person *viz* Panini who is Acharya to both Katyayana and Patanjali

कलापिवैशम्पायनान्तेवासिभ्यश्च । IV ii 104

वार्तिकम् प्रत्यक्कारिग्रहणम् ।

भाष्यम् प्रत्यक्कारिग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । अन्तेवास्यन्तेवासिभ्यो मा भूदिति । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । कलापिखाडायनग्रहणं ज्ञापकं वैशम्पायनान्तेवासिषु प्रत्यक्कारिग्रहणस्य । यदयं कलापिखाडायनग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो नान्तेवास्यन्तेवासिभ्यो भवतीति । etc

Here Katyayana's Vartika is attacked on the ground that what he means to add by means of the Vartika is already indicated by implication by the *Acharya* by his insertion of the word Khadayana in the Shaunakadi class or group, and of the word Kalapi in the sutra (IV ii 104). It is quite evident that the word *Acharya* here refers to neither Katyayana who is attacked nor to Patanjali who attacks but refers to a third person *viz* the Sutrakara who is Acharya to both Patanjali and Katyayana

Now let us turn to the 'स्वरितञित' passage again

स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले । I iii 72

भाष्यम् - स्वरितञित इति किमर्थम् ? याति वाति द्राति प्साति । स्वरितञित इति शक्यमकर्तुम् । इह कस्मान्न भवति, याति वाति द्राति प्सातीति कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफल इत्युच्यते । सर्वेषां च कर्त्रभिप्रायं क्रियाफलमस्ति । त एव विज्ञास्यामो येषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति तेभ्य आत्मनेपदं भवतीति । न चैषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति । तथाजातीयकाः खलु **आचार्येण** स्वरितञितः पठिताः, ये उभयवन्तः येषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

Here Patanjali attacks the Sutrakara and says he could have done as well without using the word स्वरितञित, and cites an Acharya in his argument against the use of the word It is evident, that, as in the passages quoted above, the word *Acharya* must refer neither to the person attacked *viz.* the Sutrakara, nor to the person attacking *viz.* the Bhasyakara, but must refer to a third person *viz.* the धातुपाठकार who is the Acharya of both Patanjali and Panini, and who is responsible for the स्वरितञित reading of roots यथा कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

4 JINENDRA BUDDHI.—

If there still linger any doubts in the mind of the reader as to the non indentity of Panini, the author of the Astadhyayi and the author of the Dh. P, the author of the Nyasa sets them at rest finally. Commenting on VII. iv. 3 he says— "प्रतिपादितं हि पूर्वं गणकारः पाणिनिर्न भवतीति । तथा चान्यो हि गणकारः अन्यश्च सूत्रकारः ।" And again on VII iv. 75. he says: यद्यत्र त्रिप्रभृतिषु निजादीनामन्ते ग्रकरणं किमर्थम ? एतद् गणकारः प्रष्टव्य. न सूत्रकारः । अन्यो हि गणकारोऽन्यश्च सूत्रकार इत्युक्तं प्राक ।

I have not been able to find out where it is definitely established (प्रतिपादित) by the author of the Nyasa that the Sutrakara and the Dhatukara are different But it should be noted that his comment on I. iii. 1. and 2 clearly suggests that Panini accepted the Dh. P. from his predecessors.* In his comment on VII. iv. 3. he says that the Dh. P. is called

* गणपाठस्यासम्यगिति पाठोऽयमीषियते । Nyasa I. iii. 1.

Paniniya, not because Panini composed it, but because he accepted it §

I must here acknowledge that I was first made aware of the passage under VII iv 3 in the Nyasa — after I had independently arrived at the conclusion that the author of the Astd was not the author of the Dh P by the remarks

As to the inclusion of Nyad in the Chatrvadi (VI ii 4[illegible]) Gahadi (IV ii 66) and the Krodyadi (IV i 80) ganas it is to be noted that the groups of words originally fixed had been augmented with later additions to them by other grammarians This probably led Jinendra Buddhi to observe in VII iv 3 ' प्रतिपादित हि पूर्वं गणकार पाणिनिन भवतीति । तथा च न्या हि गणकारोऽन्या हि सूत्रकार ' "— made by Shrish Chandra Chakravarti in his Introduction (p C) to his scholarly edition of the Nyasa But it is submitted the author of the Nyasa does not mean by the word 'ganakara' the author of the *Pratipadika* ganas, but the author of the Dh P This is quite clear from the context where the passage in question occurs in the Nyasa Cf also Nyasa on I iii 1 भूवादय। दशगणीपरिपठिता गृह्यन्ते । and ' गणपाठस्तु पूर्वंनदेवागीक्रियते । " Ibid

§ अपाणिनीयमिति । पाणिनरिदं पाणिनीयम्। न पाणिनीयम्-अपाणिनीयमिति । तेनानभ्युपगमात न तु तेनाकृतत्वात । VII iv 3

But there are great and at first sight almost insuperable difficulties in the way of our accepting the theory that the author of the Astd is not the author of the Dh P also The Dh P presupposes many of the sutras of the Astd Let us for example take the Sutra, षणा च समानाम। (VI iv 1 5) and the Sutra वचिस्वपियजादीनां किति। (VI i 15) If the author of the Dh P had not in his mind these or similar sutras while composing his Dh P he would not have collected all the seven roots whose अवणस्य स्थाने वा एकार आदेशो भवति अभ्यासलोपश्च लिटि कृति परत थलि च सेटि, in one place with the root फण् at their head similarly he would not have collected all the roots which take *Samprasarana* किति प्रत्यय परत in one place with the root यज at their head If the author of the Dh P were absolutely ignorant of any rule like ह्म्यन्त क्षणश्वसजागृणिश्व्येदिता (VII ii 5) he could not have attached ए as इत् or indicatory letter in his Dh P to such of the roots as take no *vriddhi* इडादौ सिचि परस्मैपदे परत And if he were quite innocent of any rule like द्विवितोऽथुच् (III iii 89) there would not have been found in the Dh P roots like टुवम् Such examples can be adduced by scores And this would seem to irresistibly force upon us the conclusion that the author of the Astd. is also the author of—in Goldstucker's words— at least the groundwork of the existing Dh P *

We have now arrived at a dilemma —

* We may note here one difficulty in accepting Goldstucker's view that the groundwork of the Dh P is Panini's and that it was enlarged by Acharyas that came after Panini If the Dh P was enlarged after the time of Panini then why were the *sautra* roots not included in it ?

The Dh. P does not seem to be by the author of the Astd, but seems to be the work of a predecessor of Panini. But nevertheless the arrangement of roots in the Dh P. clearly shows that the author of the Dh. P. knew very many sutras now found in the Astd and so arranged the roots in the Dh. P. as to serve the purposes of those sutras

CHAPTER III

THE PARIBHASAS

परित प्रमिताक्षरापि सर्वं विषय व्याप्तवती गता प्रतिष्ठाम ।
न खलु प्रतिहन्यते कदाचित् परिभाषेव गरीयसी यदाज्ञा ॥

शिशुपालवध- XVI 80

If any one were to pick up a copy of the Astd and try to learn the Sanskrit language from it, he will be sorely disappointed He will find that the arrangement of topics and rules (sutras) in the Astd is not the arrangement that is followed in modern works on Sanskrit grammar We must remember that the Astd was written, not for those whose mother-tongue was not Sanskrit and who had to learn Sanskrit quite anew, but for those whose mother tongue was Sanskrit, who used Sanskrit in their daily life, and who required a *short but exhaustive* hand book of Sanskrit grammar from which they could ascertain the correct form of a word whenever there arose any doubts in their minds as to its correctness Therefore the two things that were aimed at in the Astd were *brevity* and *exhaustiveness* And to secure these end there is followed in the Astd a peculiar arrangement of topics and sutras, which appears at first sight so puzzling and unmethodical to a modern student of Panini But it would be a great mistake to suppose that there is no method in the Astd The method followed in the Astd is given in what are called the Paribhasas They teach how the sutras of the Astd are to be interpreted and applied they explain

among other things, the significance of the various इत्s or indicatory letters, and of the use of different cases in the Astd They are, so to say, the key with which to unlock the intricacies of the Astd

The Paribhasas applicable to the Astd, are of two kinds —

1 Those that are expressly laid down in the Astd itself

2 Those that are applicable to the Astd though not expressly laid down therein because they are, in the words of the Paribhasendusekhara,— पाणिनीयतन्त्रे ज्ञापकन्यायसिद्धानि।

In the following few pages we shall consider only some of the important Paribhasas of the first kind We shall begin with the simplest of them, *viz* —

I

विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्। I iv 2.

Kasika — तुल्यबलविरोधो विप्रतिषेधः। यत्र द्वौ प्रसङ्गावन्यार्थावेकस्मिन् युगपत् प्राप्नुतः स तुल्यबलविरोधी विप्रतिषेधः। तस्मिन् विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यं भवति। उत्सर्गापवादनित्यानित्यान्तरङ्गबहिरङ्गेषु तुल्यबलता नास्तीति नायमस्य योगस्य विषयः। बलवदेव तत्र भवितव्यम्। अप्रवृत्तौ पर्यायेण वा प्रवृत्तौ प्राप्तायां वचनमारभ्यते। अतो दीर्घो यञि सुपि चेत्यस्यावकाशः। वृक्षाभ्याम्। प्लक्षाभ्याम्। बहुवचने झल्येदित्यस्यावकाशः। वृक्षेषु। प्लक्षेषु। इहोभयं प्राप्नोति। वृक्षेभ्यः प्लक्षेभ्यः इति। परं भवति विप्रतिषेधेन॥

The word *vipratisedha* means ' opposition of rules of equal force When two sutras having different objects in view find scope of action simultaneously in one particular case, that opposition of sutras of equal force is called *vipratisedha*.

A general rule and its exception, or an invariable and an optional rule or an *antaranga* and a *bahiranga* rule, are not rules of equal force. There the stronger prevails against the weaker. As an example of rules of equal force, see VII iii 102 and 103. The first rule declares—"When a case affix beginning with a letter of the यञ् *pratyahara* follows, the long vowel is substituted for the final of an inflective base ending in अ as वृक्ष + भ्याम=वृक्षाभ्याम. The next rule declares —" When a plural case affix beginning with a letter of the झल् *pratyahara* follows, ए is substituted for the final short अ of an inflective base" As वृक्ष + सु = वृक्षेषु. But when the plural case affix 'भ्य' follows, what rule are we to apply? For the letter भ् belongs to both the *Pratyaharas* यञ् and झल्. Are we to lengthen the short अ or substitute ए? Here there is अनियम. The present sutra comes in, and sustitutes नियम in the place of अनियम, by laying down that ए is to be substituted because VII iii 103 ordaining ए comes after VII iii 102. Thus वृक्ष + भ्यस् वृक्षेभ्य. So we arrive at the definition of Paribhasa अनियमे नियमकारिणी परिभाषा।

There is a sutra corresponding to this Astd sutra in the Purva Mimamsa Sutra of Jaimini —

पौर्वापर्ये पूर्वदौर्बल्यं प्रकृतिवत् । VI v 54

The grounds on which this sutra rests and which apply equally to the corresponding *Vyakaranasutra* under consideration are very clearly stated by Madhava in his Jaiminiya Nyayamalavistara, thus —

उत्पद्यमानं चोत्तरज्ञानं स्वविरुद्धस्य पूर्वज्ञानस्य बाधेनैवोत्पद्यते । ननु निरपेक्षत्वस्य समानत्वात् पूर्वज्ञानमेवोत्तरस्य बाधकमस्तिवति चेत् । न । पूर्वज्ञा-

नोत्पत्तिदशायामविद्यमानस्योत्तरज्ञानस्य बाधत्वायोगात् ॥ उत्तरकाले तु स्वयं बाधितं पूर्वज्ञानं कथमुत्तरस्य बाधकं भवेत् ।

In his Bhasya on I i 48 Patanjali says that the अधिकार is of three kinds and proceeds to enumerate and explain them Of these the first is described as follows —

भाष्यम् — कश्चिदेकदेशस्थः सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति । यथा प्रदीपः सुप्रज्वलितः सर्वं वेश्माभिज्वलयति ।

प्रदीप — कश्चिदिति । परिभाषाम्प इत्यर्थ ।

Thus a *Paribhasa* is, according to Patanjali, of universal application in the Astd This is but what we would expect. The *Paribhasa* being a rule of interpretation, ought to apply to the whole of the book to which it was meant to apply, if the book is the work of one author written according to a definite plan If we find that a *Paribhasa* is not of universal application, then, we may be sure, there is a grave irregularity which calls for a thorough investigation

Now, is this *Paribhasa* laid down in I iv 2 of universal application in the Astd ? Can we say of this *Paribhasa* that she एकदेशस्था सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति ? Turning to the Bhasya on the sutra under consideration, we find that Katyayana had noticed that this *Paribhasa* did not apply to the *Angadhikara* and so proposed to restate the sutra thus —

विप्रतिषेधे परमगाधिकारे पूर्वम् ।

But even this amendation would not mend matters, because there were found to be cases of परविप्रतिषेध in the अंगाधिकार and of पूर्वविप्रतिषेध in the other parts of the Astd So Patanjali offers us the counsel of despair that the word पर in the sutra be taken to mean इष्ट

भाष्यम् — यथान्यासमेवास्तु । कथं ये पूर्वविप्रतिषेधा । विप्रतिषेधे परमित्येव सिद्धम् । कथम् । परशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थ । अस्त्येव व्यवस्थायां वर्तते, तद्यथा—पूर्व पर इति । अस्त्यन्यार्थे वर्तते— परपुत्र परभार्या । अन्यपुत्रोऽन्यभार्यति गम्यते । अस्ति प्राधान्ये वर्तते तद्यथा — परमिय ब्राह्मण्यस्मिन् कुटुम्बे । प्रधानमिति गम्यते । अस्तीष्टवाची परशब्दस्तद्यथा पर धाम गत । इष्ट धाम गत इति गम्यते । तद्य इष्टवाची परशब्दस्तस्येद ग्रहणम् । विप्रतिषेधे पर यदिष्ट तद्भवतीति ।

प्रदीप - तद्य इष्टवाचीति । इष्टानिष्टविभागश्च व्याख्यानाद् बोध्य ।

उद्योत नतु लक्षणचक्षुषा तद्विभागो दुर्ज्ञेयोऽत आह इष्टानिष्टेति ।

The remarks of Kaiyata and Nagoji show where the real weakness of Patanjali s explanation lies If we accept Patanjali s rendering of the word पर by the word इष्ट, then the Paribhasa becomes worse than useless it serves no purpose as we have to fall back upon the *Vyakhyana* to know what is इष्ट Another thing to note in this connection is that Patanjali himself was not satisfied with this explanation of the Sutra and so proposed to overcome the difficulty of पूर्वविप्रतिषेधs under S I iii 11 by taking the word अधिकार in that sutra to mean अधिक कार Says he

अधिक कार — पूर्वविप्रतिषेधाश्च न पठितव्या भवति । गुणवृद्ध्यौ त्वतृच्वद्भावेभ्यो नु पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम् । नुमचिरतृच्वद्भावेभ्यो नुट् इति । नुमुटौ स्वरयिष्येते । तत्र स्वरितेनाधिक कारो भवतीति नुमुटौ भविष्यत ।‡

The Vartika and the portion of the Bhasya which we have up to now considered show that the rule laid down in I iv 2 applies, broadly speaking to the whole of the Astd

‡ M Bh N S Edition Vol II p 148

except the *Angadhikara* in the *Angadhikara* the rule is विप्रतिषेध पूर्वम्, that is exactly the reverse of what it is in the rest of the Astd Thus the *Angadhikara* does not agree with regard to its arrangement of the weaker and stronger rules with the rest of the Astd In the Astd except the *Angadhikara* the stronger rule generally speaking follows after the weaker one and prevails over it but in the *Angadhikara* on the other hand it is the stronger rule that comes first and then follows the weaker What is the explanation of this anomaly ?

II

आद्यन्तौ टकितौ । 1 1 45

Kasika – आदिष्टिद्भवत्यन्त स्किद्भवति षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्य। लविता। मुण्डो भीषयते । टिप्रदेशा — आर्धधातुकस्येड्वलादेरित्येवमादय । कित्प्रदेशा भियो हेतुभये षुक् इत्येवमादय ।

Of whatsoever the augments enunciated are distinguished by an indicatory ट् or क् they precede or follow it accordingly

This sutra explains the special use of two of the indicatory letters viz ट् and क् Where the indicatory letter of an augment is ट् that augment is to be placed before the word in the genetive case with regard to which it is enjoined while a कित् augment is to be added after the word exhibited in the genetive case with regard to which it is enjoined and becomes the end part or अन्त of the word to which it is added Thus there is a sutra (VII ii 35) which says — Ardhadhatuka affixes beginning with a consonant except य् have इट् The question arises 'Where

is this इट् to be added, in the beginning or the end or the middle of the आर्धधातुक affix? This sutra answers the question The indicatory ट् shows, that it is to be placed *before* the *ardhadhatuka* affix Thus "स्य" in the future termination स्यति is an *ardhadhatuka* affix, when this is added to the root, it takes the augment इट्, इ, being placed before स्य, thus भू + इष्यति = भविष्यति. Similarly भविता

Similarly by sutra VII iii. 40 the root भी takes the augment षुक् in forming the causative This having an indicatory क् is to be added after the root भी and when added becomes the end part of the root, as भी षुक् णिच् त = भीषयते

Thus far everything is quite clear. But we come across sutras like चरेष्ट and आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः · In ट the real affix is अ, the letter ट् being indicatory Now an affix is "an addition placed at the beginning or end of a root, stem or word, to modify its meaning" (C O E D) Where is the addition अ to be placed, at the beginning of root चर् or at its end? The indicatory letter ट् would seem to point to the beginning of the root चर्, as the proper place But the sutra परश्च, (III i 2) asks us to place the affix अ after the root चर्. How to come out of this difficulty? The question has been dealt with by Katyayana and Patanjali at length, and we shall turn to them

वार्तिकम् - टकितोराद्यन्तविधाने प्रत्ययप्रतिषेध ।

भाष्यम् - टकितोराद्यन्तविधाने प्रत्ययस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य । प्रत्यय आदिरन्तो वा मा भूदिति । चरेष्ट आतोऽनुपसर्गे क इति ।

When we lay down a rule that a टित् and a कित् become respectively the beginning and end of a stem we have to exclude a *pratyaya* from the operation of the rule so that a *pratyaya*, shall not be taken to be either a beginning or an end of the stem it is added to, for example in चरट् and अनानुपसर्गे क

वार्तिकम् - परवचनात् सिद्धम् ।

भाष्यम् - परवचनात्प्रत्यय आद्यन्तौ न भविष्यति ।

A *pratyaya* will be neither a beginning nor an end of the term because S परश्च (III 1 2) lays down that a *pratyaya* shall be placed *after* the stem

वार्तिकम् - परवचनात्सिद्धमिति चेन्नापवादत्वात् ।

भाष्यम् - परवचनात्सिद्धमिति चेत्तन्न । किं कारणम् ? अपवादत्वात् । अपवादोऽयं योग । तद्यथा मिदचोऽन्त्यात् पर इत्येष योग स्थाने योगत्वस्य प्रत्ययपरत्वस्य चापवाद ।

It cannot be said that the difficulty is solved by S III 1 2 Why ? Because this rule is an exception (to S परश्च) just as 'मिदचोऽन्त्यात् पर ' is an exception to the rules "षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा " and 'परश्च'

भाष्यम् - विषम उपन्यास । युक्तं तत्र यदनवकाशं मित्करणं स्थानेयोगत्वं प्रत्ययपरत्वं च बाधते । इह पुनरुभयं सावकाशम् । टित्करणस्यावकाश —टित इत्यादि यथा स्यात् । कित्करणस्यावकाश कित्यकारलोपो यथा स्यात् ।

Your statement is wide of the mark It is but proper in the case of III 1 70 (इको झल् ?), that the indicatory

letter म्, having no other purpose than to indicate that the *pratyaya* न is to be placed after the last vowel, according to sutra मिद्चोऽन्त्यात्परः, should make that sutra an exception to S. षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा and परश्च But in the case of sutras चरट् and आनातुगमन ट, both the indicatory letters ट् and ट् have other scope than the indication of the place where the *pratyayas* are to be added to the roots The indicatory letter ट् in the *pratyaya* ट shows that the feminine of the word which is formed by the addition of ट is to be formed with the affix ङीप् (IV 1 15) as कुरुचरी, मद्रचरी and the indicatory letter ट in the addition ट shows that the भ at the end of a stem is to be elided when adding the affix ट (VI iv 64) Therefore the indicatory letters ट and ट in SS चरट् and आनोनुगमन ट having other scope, cannot be deemed to be there for the purpose of showing the place where the affixes are to be added to the stem and so they cannot make S I i 45 an exception to S परश्च

भाष्यम - प्रयोजन नाम तद्वक्तव्य यन्नियोगत स्यात् । यदि चाय नियोगत पर स्यात् तत एतत्प्रयोजन स्यात् । कुतो नु खल्वेतत्— टित्करणादय परो भविष्यति न पुनरादिरिति । कित्करणाच्च परो भविष्यति न पुनरन्त इति ।

प्रदीप प्रयोजनमिति । सति पाठे प्रयोजनमेतत्स्यात् । पाठेन त्वन्यथासिद्धमित्यर्थ ।

भाष्यम्·- टितश्चाप्यपरिहारः। स्यादेव ह्ययं टित्करणादादिर्न पुनरन्त।

Your explanation does not remove the difficulty about the टित् affixes also. On account of the indicatory ट् the *pratyaya* would necessarily become the आदि of the stem, and not पर.

भाष्यम् ·- क तर्हीदानीमिद स्यात्—टित ईकारो भवतीति।

Then where does the rule, that a word ending in a टित् affix takes the affix ई to form the feminine apply ?

भाष्यम् - य उभयवान्—गापोष्टगिति। *

To the case of an affix which has both the indicatory letters ट् and क्; to "गापोष्टक्" for example.

वार्तिकम् ·- सिद्धं तु षष्ठ्यधिकारे वचनात्।

भाष्यम् :- सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्। षष्ठ्यधिकारेऽय योग· कर्तव्य। आद्यन्तौ षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्येति।

The Pratyayas can be saved from the operation of this rule (*paribhasa*) How ? This rule should be put under the domain of the षष्ठी, thus — "Affixes having a ट् or a क् as an indicatory letter, become respectively the beginning and end of that which is put in the षष्ठी or the genetive case"

वार्तिकम् :- आद्यन्तयोर्वा षष्ठ्यर्थत्वात्तदभावेऽसम्प्रत्ययः।

भाष्यम् :- आद्यन्तयोर्वा षष्ठ्यर्थत्वात् तदभावे षष्ठ्या अभावे असम्प्रत्ययः स्यात—आदिरन्तौ वा न भविष्यति।

* प्रदीप ·- अत्र किंस्यात्परत्वादन्तत्वमिति टिदन्तमेतद्भवतीति दोषोऽसमवकाशः। ततश्च चरेष्ट इत्ययमादिःस्यात्।

Or, because to express the sense of 'आदि' or 'अन्त' the i e षष्ठी or the genetive case is necessary, therefore when there is no षष्ठी used, neither 'आदि' nor 'अन्त' can be understood

भाष्यम् - युक्त पुनर्यच्छब्दनिमित्तको नामार्थ स्यात् ? नार्थनिमित्तकेन नाम शब्देन भवितव्यम् ?

Is it right that the meaning should be subservient to words? Rather, is it not that words should be subservient to sense?

भाष्यम् - अर्थनिमित्तक एव शब्द । तत्कथम् ? आद्यन्तौ षष्ठ्यर्थौ। न चात्र षष्ठीं पश्याम । ते मन्यामहे—आद्यन्तावेवात्र न स्त । तयोर भावे षष्ठ्यपि न भवतीति ।

Yes certainly it is the sense that should cause the use of words How then? Whenever we have to express the sense of '*adi*' or '*anta*' we must necessarily use a षष्ठी This is the beginning *of* this, this is the end *of* that We do not see any *sasthi* here (*i e* in SS like चरट् and आतोऽनुपसर्गे क) Therefore we think here there is neither an *adi* nor an *anta* meant

The portion of the Bhasya we have considered up to now establishes that —

1 The sutra आद्यन्तौ टकितौ is an exception to the sutra परश्च (परवचनाटिगदमितिषेत्रापवादत्वात्)

And

2 The difficulty indicated in वा । टकितोराद्यन्तविधान प्रत्ययप्रतिषेध I, can be met in two ways as indicated in the two वार्तिकs —

a सिद्धं तु षष्ठ्यधिकारे वचनात् ।

b आद्यन्तयोर्वा षष्ठ्यर्थत्वात्तदभावेऽसम्प्रत्यय ।

So in S चरेष्ट, 'चरे' is in the ablative case and consequently ट cannot be taken to be there for the purpose of indicating that the अ is to be added at the beginning of root चर् itself such would have been taken to be the purpose of the indicatory ट् if 'चर were a *sasthi*, when the rule आद्यन्तौ टकितौ would have applied Similar is the case with S आतोऽनुपसर्गे क It is only the absense of a *sasthi*, (आत being abl sing) which saves the *pratyaya* अ from being the end part of the root to which it is added

Now let us see if there are any sutras, where an affix with an indicatory ट or क is enjoined (विहित), and where the *prakriti* or the stem is indubitably put in the genetive case Many such cases occur, of them गापोष्टक् and व्रीहिशाल्योर्ढक् are two Here indubitably the words गापा and व्रीहिशाल्य expressing the *prakritis* or stems, are put in the genetive case And according to the conclusion arrived at in the Bhasya, we shall have to say, that the use of the genetive makes the *pratyaya* the end part or *anta* of the *prakritis* or stems to which it is added We can say — आद्यन्तौ षष्ठ्यर्थौ। षष्ठी चात्र पश्याम । ते मन्यामहे आद्यन्तावत्र स्त । तयामपि षष्ठ्यपि भवतीति । How to avoid this difficulty? Kaiyata says on this point - गापोष्टक्, व्रीहिशाल्योर्ढक् इत्यादावपि आनन्तर्यसम्बन्धे षष्ठी। न त्ववयवावयविसम्बन्धे। प्रत्ययपरत्वेन प्रतियोग समभिहितेनाकांक्षाविच्छेदादनर्थितादन्यानुपस्थानात्। Here Kaiyata says that the sutra परश्च satisfies our आकांक्षा with regard to the place of the affixes टक and

टर and so, there being no आकाङ्क्षा about the place of the terminations the sutra आद्यन्तौ टकितौ does not apply But here Kaiyata contradicts the Bhasya in as much as it has been established in the Bhasya, that S आद्यन्तौ टकितौ, like S मिद् चान्त्यात् परः, is an exception to the rule परश्च Another explanation is given by the Nyasa — नच गापाष्टगित्यादौ प्रकृतयाऽवयवषष्ठ्या निर्दिष्टा । किं तर्हि । सुपां सुपा भवन्तीति पञ्चम्यर्थे या षष्ठी तयेति । This explanation does not, as Kaiyatas does, go against what has been said in the Bhasya A reference to III ii 6, 7, 8, and 9 will show that the genetive in गापाष्टक् is really anomalous S प्रे दाज्ञः and S समि ख्यः, the two sutras preceding S गापाष्टक्, and S हरतेरनुद्यमनेऽच्, the sutra that follows S गापाष्टक्, all of them put the *prakritis* or stems in the ablative case And in S प्रे दाज्ञः, the two roots have been given a singular ending to avoid the awkward and unwieldy form of the ablative dual—दाज्ञाभ्याम् Then why should Panini bethink himself of using the genetive in S गापाष्टक् on the strength of the rule सुपां सुपा भवन्ति, which does not occur in the Astd, and which we may say was unknown to him ?

Thus the difficulty about the use of the genetive in the two sutras remains to be explained

Thus we see that the *Paribhasa* आद्यन्तौ टकितौ is not of universal application in the Astd It does not hold good in the case of sutras like प्रैहिमाल्याङ्किङ् and गापाष्टक्,

III & IV

तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य । I. i 66.

Kasika.— तस्मिन्निति सप्तम्यर्थनिर्देशे पूर्वस्यैव कार्यं भवति नोत्तरस्य । इको यणचि । दध्युदकम् । मध्विदम् । पचत्योदनम् । निर्दिष्टग्रहणमानन्तर्यार्थम् । अग्निचिदत्रेति व्यवहितस्य मा भूत् ॥

तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य । I. i. 67.

Kasika:— निर्दिष्टग्रहणमनुवर्तते । तस्मादिति पञ्चम्यर्थनिर्देश. । उत्तरस्यैव कार्यं भवति न पूर्वस्य । तिङ्ङतिङः । ओदनं पचति । इह न भवति । पचत्योदनमिति ॥

Let us take these sutras separately and consider them S 66 lays down that "when a term is exhibited in the seventh case in these sutras, the operation directed is to be understood as affecting the state of what immediately precedes that which the term denotes" Thus in the sutra "इको यणचि" (VI. i 77.), the word 'अचि' is put in the locative case, and therefore the sutra means that इ, उ, ऋ, ऌ, followed by a vowel (अचि) are changed into य्, व्, र्, ल्, (यण्), the literal translation of the sutra being — "Of इक् there is यण् in ." The force of 'in' or the locative case being to induce changes in the letter preceding the vowel. Thus दधि + उदकम् = दध्युदकम् ; so also मध्विदम्, पचत्योदनम् ।

Now let us see whether this *paribhasa* is of universal application in the Astd. Many cases will occur to the reader in which this *paribhasa* is not obeserved; of them ऋदृशोऽङि गुणः (?) स्ये (VII. ii. 70.) is one. Let us consider it.

ऋद्धनोः स्ये । VII. ii 70.

Kasika ;— ऋकारान्तानां धातूनां हन्तेश्च स्ये इडागमो भवति। करिष्यति । हनिष्यति । स्वरतेर्वेट्त्वादृद्धनोः स्य इत्येतद्भवति विप्रतिषेधेन। स्वरिष्यति । तपरकरणं विस्पष्टार्थम् ॥

Now, according to this strict interpretation of the sutra, what form do we get, of हन् स्य तिप्? Here the root हन् is followed by स्य, which is exhibited in the locative case in the sutra "ऋद्धनोः स्ये." According to the *paribhasa* "तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य", the कार्य or the operation enjoined by this sutra, *viz.* the 'इडागम,' is to be understood as affecting the state of what immediately precedes the स्य, *viz* the roots ending in ऋ and the root हन्. And so the root हन् in this case, and not the *pratyaya* स्य, has इट् as an आगम. And this आगम comes at the beginning of the root हन् according to the *paribhasa*, "आद्यन्तौ टकितौ". Therefore we have :— हन् स्य तिप् = इट् हन् स्य तिप् = इहंस्यति, which is absurd. To avoid this difficulty, the Siddhanta Kaumudi paraphrases the sutra as follows :— ऋतो हन्तेश्च स्यस्य इट् स्यात् ; and the Balamanorama comments - ऋत् हन् अनयोः इत्वात्सम्पर्थे षष्ठी । स्ये इति षष्ठ्यर्थे सप्तमी. Thus the use of the locative in 'स्ये' is wrong. The word स्ये must be changed to स्यस्य and the word "ऋद्धनोः" to "ऋद्धन्भ्याम्" to give us the correct form हनिष्यति. Thus we see the sutra ऋद्धनोः स्ये is an exception to the *paribhasa*—तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य.

This exception needs explanation. The traditional explanation is that छन्दोवत्सूत्राणि भवन्ति, and that in the Chandas सुपां सुपो भवन्ति, and that here there is a षष्ठ्यर्थे सप्तमी. But

can we apply the analogy of the Chandas to the sutras of the Astd ? The Chandas is not the work of one man or one age The diversity in the use of cases in the Chandas is attributable to that cause But how to apply the analogy of the Chandas to the Astd which is supposed to be the work of one single author, namely Panini ?

Let us now proceed to the next *paribhasa*—तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य It lays down —' When a sutra enjoins some operation and in that sutra a term is exhibited in the ablative case the operation enjoined is to be understood as affecting the state of what follows immediately after the thing denoted by the word in the ablative case

Let us for example consider the sutra उद स्थास्तम्भ्वो पूर्वस्य I (VIII iv 61) This sutra consists of three words viz उद , स्थास्तम्भ्वो and पूर्वस्य It teaches the substitution of a पूर्वसवर्ण letter Now in whose place is the substitution of the पूर्वसवर्ण letter to be made ? We get the answer to this question from the text of the sutra itself, when we interpret it according to the *paribhasa*—' तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य ' In the sutra उद स्थास्तम्भ्वो पूर्वस्य, the word उद is put in the ablative case Therefore the operation enjoined by the sutra must affect the state of what follows immediately after उद्, that is, it must affect the words स्था and स्तम्भ् So the substitution of the पूर्वसवर्ण letter is to be made in the place of the first letter (स्) of the words स्था and स्तम्भ (आदे परस्य I i 54) Thus उद् + स्थानम् = उत्थानम्

Let us see whether this *paribhasa* has any exceptions If we turn to S VI i 75, we shall find one The sutra reads—' दीर्घात् ' The words छे and तुक् are induced (अनुवृत्त)

from SS. VI. i. 73 and 71 respectively. 'तुक्' is an āgama and comes at the end, and forms the end-part, of the word to which it is added. Now 'दीर्घात्' is a word in the ablative, and so the paribhā-ā, तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य, applies. And what is the 'उत्तर' of 'दीर्घ' in the case of this sutra? It is the letter छ. And strictly speaking the तुक् will be an āgama of छ, and so we get, not म्लेच्छति, which is correct, but म्लेछत्ति, which is impossible. Kaiyata tries to escape from this difficulty thus:— दीर्घाच्छे तुग् भवतीत्यत्र (1) षष्ठीस्थाने व्यत्ययेन पञ्चमीति व्याख्यानात् (2) सुराच्छायेत्यादेर्ज्ञापकाद् दीर्घस्यैव तुग्भवति न तु छस्य।* But this explanation does not explain why the sutra reads दीर्घात्, giving rise to so much difficulty, and not दीर्घस्य, which would not have contravened the paribhā-ā तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य, and so would have raised no difficulty. And this anomalous use of the ablative becomes the more glaring, when we compare the genetive in SS. ह्रस्वस्य पिति कृति तुक् (VI. i. 71) and आङ्माङोश्च (VI. i. 74.).

Thus we see that the sutra दीर्घात् (VI. i. 75.) is an exception to the paribhā-ā तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य.

"पञ्चमीनिर्देशेन क्रियमाणं कार्यं वर्णान्तरेण अव्यवहितस्य परस्य ज्ञेयम्।" Siddhanta Kaumudi. It is interesting to note that the whole of the chapter dealing with verbal accents is an exception to the paribhā-ā, as interpreted above.

'अत्र प्रकरणे (तिङन्तस्वरप्रकरणे) पञ्चमीनिर्देशेऽपि नानन्तर्यमाश्रीयते'†

V

स्वरितेनाधिकारः। I. iii. 11.

Kasika — स्वरितेनेति इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तृतीया। स्वरितो नाम स्वरविशेषो वर्णधर्मः। तेन चिह्नेनाधिकारो वेदितव्यः। स्वरितगुणयुक्तं शब्दरूपमधिकृतम्त्वा-

* Kaiyata at the end of his comment on तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य. I. i. 67.

† Siddhanta Kaumudi on S. पूजनात्पूजितमनुदात्तं काष्ठादिभ्यः VIII i. 67

7—2623

दुत्तरत्रोपतिष्ठत । प्रतिज्ञास्वरिता पाणिनीया । प्रत्यय । धातो । ङ्याप्प्राति पदिकात् । अङ्गस्य । भस्य । पदस्य ॥

'When in this collection of sutras, there is any sutra that has a circumflex accent, it denotes that it is the beginning of a topic or subject and the word marked with the svarita accent presents itself that is is to be understood in the *subsequent* sutras' But there occur strangely enough some cases where a word in a subsequent sutra presents itself in a previous sutra For example —

ईश से ॥ VII. ii 77

ईडजनार्ध्वे च ॥ VII ii 78

Siddhanta Kaumudi— ईशीड्जना मेध्वेशब्दया सार्वधातुकयारिद स्यात् । योगविभागा वैचित्र्यार्थं ॥

Tattwabodhini — यथाश्रुतसूत्रन्यासे ईशा ध्वेशब्दे परे ईशिध्वमिति न सिद्ध्येदत आह-ईशीड्जनामिति । वैचित्र्यार्थं इति । ध्व इत्यस्य पूर्वत्रापकर्ष । से इत्यस्योत्तरत्रानुवृत्तिरित्येव विचित्रवाधार्थं ॥

Now let us turn to the Bhasya and see what Katyayana and Patanjali have to say about this sutra स्वरितेनाधिकार .

भाष्यम् — किमर्थमिदमुच्यते ? ।

वार्तिकम् — अधिकार प्रतियोग तस्यानिर्देशार्थं ।

भाष्यम् — अधिकार क्रियते प्रतियोग तस्यानिर्देशार्थं इति ॥ किमिद प्रतियोगमिति ? । याग योग प्रति प्रतियोगम् । यागे योग तस्य ग्रहण मा कार्य मिति ॥ किं गतमेतदियता सूत्रेण ? । गतमित्याह ॥ कुत ? । लोकत ॥ तद्यथा लोके "अधिकृताऽसौ ग्राम "अधिकृतोऽसौ नगरे' इत्युच्यत या यत्र व्यापार गच्छति । शब्देन चाप्यधिकृतेन का[illegible]या व्यापार शक्योऽवगन्तुम यदतो योग याग उपस्थानात् ॥

वार्तिकम् — न वा निर्दिश्यमानाधिकृतत्वाद्यथा लोके ॥

भाष्यम् — न वा एतत्प्रयोजनमस्ति ॥ किं कारणम् ? । निर्दिश्यमानाधि कृतत्वात् । यथा लोके । निर्दिश्यमानमधिकृत गम्यते । तद्यथा— देवदत्ताय गौर्दीय

ताम्' 'यज्ञदत्ताय' 'विष्णुमित्राय' इति । गौरिति गम्यते । एवमिहापि "पदरुज विशस्पृशो घञ्" "सृ स्थिरे" "भावे" घञिति गम्यते ॥

वार्तिकम् — अन्यनिर्देशस्तु निवर्तकस्तस्मात्परिभाषा ॥

भाष्यम् — अन्यनिर्देशस्तु लोके निवर्तको भवति । तद्यथा 'देवदत्ताय गौर्दीयताम्' 'विष्णुमित्राय कम्बल' इति कम्बलो गोर्निवर्तको भवति। एवमिहापि "अभिविधौ भाव इनुण्" घञो निवर्तक स्यात् तस्मात्परिभाषा कर्तव्या ॥

वार्तिकम् — अधिकारपरिमाणाज्ञान तु ॥

भाष्यम् — अधिकारपरिमाणाज्ञान तु भवति। न ज्ञायते कियन्तमवधि मधिकारोऽनुवर्तत इति ॥

वार्तिकम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञानार्थं तु ।

भाष्यम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञानार्थं एव तर्हि अय योगो वक्तव्य । अधिकारपरिमाण ज्ञास्यामीति ॥ कथ पुन "स्वरितेनाधिकार" इत्यनेनाधिकार-परिमाण शक्य विज्ञातुम् ? । एव वक्ष्यामि—"स्वरिते नाधिकार" इति । स्वरित हृष्ट्वाधिकारो न भवतीति ॥ केनेदानीमधिकारो भविष्यति ? । लौकिकोऽधिकार ॥

वार्तिकम् — नाधिकार इति चेदुक्तम् ॥

भाष्यम् — किमुक्तम् ? । "अन्यनिर्देशस्तु निवर्तकस्तस्मात् परिभाषा" इति॥ अधिकारार्थमेव तर्ह्यय योगो वक्तव्य । ननु चोक्त "अधिकारपरिमाणा ज्ञान तु" इति ? ।

वार्तिकम् — यावतिथोऽनुबन्धस्तावतो योगानिति वचनात्सिद्धम् ॥

भाष्यम् — यावतिथोऽनुबध्यते तावतो योगानधिकारोऽनुवर्तत इति वक्तव्यम् ॥ अथेदानीं यत्राल्पीयासोऽल , भूयसश्च योगानधिकारोऽनुवर्तते, कथ तत्र कर्तव्यम् ? ॥

वार्तिकम् — भूयसि प्राग्वचनम् ॥

With this Vārtika Katyayana has finished his discussion of this sutra Let us briefly state the conclusions he has arrived at —

(1) The svarita' marks the governing word So a svarita stands at the commencement of a domain

(2) The serial number (प्रत्याहारक्रमेण Uddyota) of the letter which is used as the *anubandha* of the governing word indicates the number of sutras which the word governs

(3) In case the number of sutras which are to be governed by a word exceeds the serial number of any letter in the governing word then the use of the word 'प्राग्' is made and when not made already in the sutra, ought to be made (cf. Bhasya — भूयसि प्राग्वचनं कर्तव्यम् । प्रागमुत इति वक्तव्यम् ।)

Now let us see how far the last of the rules is observed in the Astd. We come across sutras like 'प्राग्वतेष्ठञ्' 'प्राग्हितात्' 'प्राग्घिताद्यत्' etc. where the author of the sutras indicates the extent of the domains of the various affixes by the use of the word 'प्राक्'. But in sutras like 'अगस्त्य' (VI. iv 1), the use of 'प्राक्', *though quite necessary to indicate the extent of the* 'Adhikāra' is not made Therefore Katyayana tells us that, where the use of the word 'prāk', though necessary, is not made we ought to insert it into the text of the sutra. (cf Bhasya — भूयसि प्राग्वचनं कर्तव्यम् । प्रागमुत इति वक्तव्यम्) Thus Katyayana noted that there was no uniformity in the Astd with regard to the use of the word prāk, to indicate *the extent of the domain and he proposed to insert the word* 'prak, whenever necessary, into the text of the sutra

In this connection the following observations of a Naiyayika quoted in the Nyāsa are interesting —

"नैयायिक इत्याह —क्वचिदर्थोऽवधित्वेन गृह्यते यथा–आर्हाद् भत्रनादिति। क्वचित्प्रत्यय 'प्राग्वते' 'आचत्वात्' इति। क्वचित्प्रकृति 'आकडारात्' इति। क्वचिदेकदेश 'प्राग्दीव्यतोऽण्' इति। क्वचिन्निरवधि प्रत्यय 'ङ्याप्प्रातिपदिकाद्' इति। तेनायमात्मनो वैचित्र्यमाचार्यो दर्शयतीत्यवसीयते" Nyasa V i. 1

Thus the Naiyāyika comes to the conclusion that the Acārya exhibits his vaicitrya or whimsicality *

Is the absence of uniformity in the use of the word प्राक्, in the sutras to indicate the extent of an अधिकार or domain due to the वैचित्र्य of the author of the Astd or is it due to the conditions under which he worked ?

We have seen above that Katyayana *proposes to add* words to the effect 'प्रागमुत', wherever necessary, to the existing text of sutras and to this extent he proposes to meddle with the text of the sutras This Patanjali does not relish and so he tries to defend the existence of the sutra स्वरितेनाधिकार on other grounds which are summarised at the end of his Bhasya on the sutra in the following gāthā —

अधिकारगतिस्त्रयी विशेषायाधिकं कार्यम् ।
अथ यान्याधिक यार पूर्वविप्रतिषेधार्थं म ॥

These प्रयोजन्s of the sutra should be rejected mainly on two grounds First they have no support from tradition otherwise Kātyāyana would have known them and dealt with them in his Vārtika and they seem to have been unknown to Vartikakāras other than Kātyāyana also otherwise Patanjali would have quoted them, as he quotes the Saunāgas etc Secondly in order to have the प्रयोजन्s mentioned in the gāthā Patanjali proposes to imagine 'svarita' where it did not exist in the text of the Astd as given to him by tradition Thus on the first of the three प्रयोजन्s he writes —

"अधिकारगति — गोविन्दोऽयमनेनपरेण गाग्यादयम् चेदितम । तत्र कर्तव्य भवति । यदिदम् स्वरितेन ।' No a the fu are used in

* As to who the Naiyayika is compare —
"वैचित्र्यमाचार्याणां सूत्रकारोऽनुमानिधि ।
भावे विज्ञाविज पये संप्रत्ययनिरूपणे ॥ Vakyapadiya II. 457.

'स्वरयिष्यते' It shows that the 'स्वरितग्रहण' had no svarita in the text of the Astd as given by tradition to Patanjali Similarly he further on says — "अधिकारः। पूर्वविप्रतिषेधाश्च न पठितव्या भवन्ति—'गुणवृद्ध्यौत्वतृज्वद्भावेभ्यो नुम् पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम्' 'नुमचिरतृज्वद्भावेभ्यो नुट्' इति। नुम्नुटौ स्वरयिष्यते। तत्र स्वरितेनाधिकारो भविष्यतीति नुम्नुटौ भविष्यतः।" *Note again the word 'स्वरयिष्येते'* The remarks made above on 'स्वरयिष्यते' apply here also Moreover Patanjali seems himself to have been dissatisfied with this explanation of the Pūrvavipratiṣedhas. For further on, under S 'विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्', where this topic of Vipratiṣedha has been principally dealt with he defends Pūrvavipratiṣedhas on other grounds by taking the word 'पर' in S 'विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्' to mean 'इष्ट' (see p 36)

We shall consider one more Paribhāṣā viz. 'यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्', and shall finish with this chapter dealing with the Paribhāṣas

VI

यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्। I iii 10

Kasika — संख्याशब्देन क्रमो लक्ष्यते। यथासंख्यं यथाक्रममनुदेशो भवति। अनुदिश्यत इत्यनुदेशः। पश्चादुच्चार्यत इत्यर्थः। समानां समसंख्यानां समपरिपठितानामुद्देशिनामनुदेशिना च यथाक्रममुद्देशिभिरनुदेशिनः सम्बध्यन्ते। तूदीशलातुरवर्मतीकूचवाराड्ढक्छण्ढञ्यकः। प्रथमात्प्रथमो द्वितीयाद्द्वितीय इत्यादि। तौदेयः। शालातुरीयः। वार्मतेयः। कौचवार्यः। समानामिति किम्। लक्षणेत्थंभूताख्यानभागवीप्सासु प्रतिपर्यनवः। लक्षणादयश्चत्वारोऽर्थाः। प्रत्यादयस्त्रयः। सर्वेषां सर्वत्र कर्मप्रवचनीयसंज्ञा भवति। इह कस्मान् न भवति—'वेशोयश आदेर्भगाद्यल्ख च' इति। स्वरितेन लिङ्गेन यथासंख्यम्। यत्र नेष्यते तत्र स्वरितत्वं न प्रतिज्ञायते। स्वरितेनाधिकारः (I iii 11) इति स्वरितग्रहणं पूर्वेणापि सम्बध्यते॥

When a rule involves the case of an equal number of karyas and kāryins their mutual *correspondence or* assignment each to each is according to the order of enumeration.

It is laid down in III. i 134. (नन्दिग्रहिपचादिभ्यो ल्युणिन्यचः) that the affixes 'ल्यु', 'णिनि' and 'अच्' are added to the 'नन्दि', the 'ग्रहि', and the 'पच्' classes of words. Now the question arises whether each of the three classes of words takes all the three affixes or two only or one only. And further if each class takes only two affixes or only one, then which one or two of the three does it take? Now here there is 'अनियम'. The paribhāṣā "यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्" comes in and tells us exactly how to add the affixes. The affix ल्यु is to be added to the words of the 'नन्दि' class, 'णिनि' to the words of the 'ग्रहि' class and 'अच्' to the words of the 'पच्' class. The addition must be respectively according to the order of enumeration of the 'prakṛtis' and the 'pratyayas' in the sutra and not as one pleases.

Even this very simple paribhāṣā is not without exceptions. One exception is pointed out by the Kasika (I iii 10) in the sentence — इह कस्मान्न भवति "यशोयशआदेर्भगाद्यल्खौ च" इति।. However, the reading of the sutra in the Bhāṣya and the Siddhānta Kaumudī is 'वेशोयशआदेर्भगाद्यल्खौ' (IV iv 131). On this sutra the Siddhānta Kaumudī remarks — यथासंख्यं नेष्यते। The sutra कर्तृकर्मणोश्च भूकृञोः (III iii 127) is another exception. The Siddhānta Kaumudī again remarks — यथासंख्यं नेष्यते।.

The Bhāṣya on this sutra falls into three main parts as divided by the editor of the Nirṇayasāgara edition. First we have the 'उदाहरणाधिकरण' where the question as to what are the right illustrations of the application of the sutra is settled. Secondly we have the 'सूत्रप्रयोजनाधिकरण', which explains the *raison d'être* of the sutra. Thirdly and this is the most important part of the Bhāṣya we have the 'यथासंख्यानुदेशविषयनिर्णयाधिकरण', which considers the field for the operation of the 'Yathāsaṅkhya paribhāṣā'. We are here

concerned only with this third 'adhikarana' In this adhikarana two possibilities are considered, first, 'Yathāsankhya' when there is 'शब्दतः साम्य' or equality in the number of words, and secondly, 'Yathāsankhya' when there is 'अर्थतः साम्य', or equality of the number things denoted by the words It is shown that whichever of the two alternatives we adopt for the sutra, there will remain some exceptions to its application Some of these exceptions to the 's'abdatah sāmya' paksa are removed by taking the paribhāsā to apply only to those cases where there is 'samānayogavacana', i. e. where both the kāryas and the kāryins are to be found mentioned in one and the same sutra. (cf. Vārtika — "न वा सामानयोगवचनात्"). But even if we accept this 'S'abdatah sāmya paksa' with the qualification of the 's'amānayogavacana', there still *remain some cases to which the 'Yathāsankhya' rule does* not apply. Thus there are exceptions if we adopt the 'arthatah sāmya' alternative, and there are exceptions if we adopt the 's'abdatah sāmya' alternative, with the qualification of the 'samānayogavacana' Both these paksas or alternatives and the difficulties in the way of accepting either of them are pointed out by Kātyāyana and he leaves the matter there. And the Bhāsyakāra rightly sums up the position of Kātyāyana in the words – तस्माद्यस्मिन् पक्षेऽल्पीयांसो दोषास्तमास्थाय प्रतिविधेयं दोषेषु।

But Patanjali was unwilling to leave the matter at this stage. So he goes on to say :—

अथवैवं वक्ष्यामि "यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समाना स्वरितेन" ततः "अधिकारः" अधिकारश्च भवति स्वरितेनेति ॥ एवमपि स्वरित दृष्ट्वा संदेहः स्यात्–न ज्ञायते–किमयं यथासंख्यार्थं आहोस्विदधिकारार्थं इति ॥ सन्देहमात्रमेतद्भवति। सर्वसन्देहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते '*व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्*' इति। यथासंख्यार्थं इति व्याख्यास्यामः ॥

The weakness of this explanation of Patanjali's is quite evident The fact that Katyāyana or any other Vārtikakāra did not know of it shows that it is not supported by tradition or paramparā The weakest point in his explanation is pointed out by Patanajali himself saying—एवमपि स्वरित दृष्ट्वा सन्देह स्यात् etc. To get out of this difficulty he falls back on vyakhyāna.

A paribhāṣā is defined as 'अनियमे नियमकारिणी' Then if by a svarita Pānini taught us that we should know that an adhikāra begins (I iii 11) and also that in some cases there is the application of the Yathasankhya' rule then of what use would the svarita be? So Patanjali's explanation is unacceptable

Thus it will be seen that whatever the interpretation we adopt for the 'Yathāsankhya rule it has still some exceptions The 'Yathāsankhya' rule is not of universal application in the Astd And this is a fact which demands an explanation

We have now finished with the sutras relating to the Paribhāṣās We have seen that *in the Astd there is not a single important Paribhasa that has not important exceptions.* What is this due to?

CHAPTER IV

THE SANJNĀS IN THE ASTD

Having dealt with some of the most important Paribhā sasūtras, we shall now turn to the Sanjnāsūtras, and see how far the Astd. is uniform in its use of the sanjnās or technical terms.

1. अपृक्त एकाल्प्रत्ययः । I. ii 41.

This sutra tells us that 'an affix consisting of a single letter is called अपृक्त'. In this sutra it is to be noted the word अपृक्त is masculine in gender But in sutra हल्ङ्याब्भ्यो दीर्घात्सुतिस्यपृक्तं हल् । (VI. i 68), the word अपृक्त is neuter. It should not be deemed that the difference between the two sutras as regards the gender of 'अपृक्त' is of little importance. Some words seem to have been common to the various schools of grammar at the time of Panini, sometimes exhibiting a difference only in gender Thus the word सार्वधातुक is used as a neuter noun in the Astd., *cf.* तिङ्शित् सार्वधातुकम् । (III. iv. 113). But with the Āpis'alas it was feminine in gender, *cf.* तुरुस्तुशम्यमः सार्वधातुकासु छन्दसि, quoted in Kasika VII iii. 95. as an Āpis'ala sutra It is interesting to note that in the Ṛkprātis'ākhya 11-2 the word अपृक्त is used as a neuter noun *cf* अपृक्तमेकाक्षरमद्वियोनि यत् ।.

2 In S I iv. 3., यूस्त्र्याख्यौ नदी, it is laid down that "नदी" is the technical term for feminine nouns ending in ई or ऊ But in S. II. i 20 (नदीभिश्च), and S. V iv 110 (नदीपौर्णमास्याग्रहायणीभ्यः) and in many other sutras the word नदी is used in its common dictionary sense of a river.

3. कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्म I. iv. 49. The word 'कर्मन्' is used in this sense in S I. iv 32 (कर्मणा यमभिप्रैति स सम्प्रदानम्।) etc. But in S. I. iii 14. the word कर्मन् is used in the sense of क्रिया

कर्तरि कर्मव्यतिहारे ॥ I iii 14.

वार्तिकम्·— क्रियाव्यतिहार ॥

भाष्यम्:— क्रियाव्यतिहार इति वक्तव्यम्। कर्मव्यतिहार इत्युच्यमाने इहापि प्रसज्येत-देवदत्तस्य धान्यं व्यतिलुनन्तीति। इह च न स्यात्-व्यतिलुनते, व्यतिपुनत इति ॥

Kātyāyana rightly lays down that a particular exclusive meaning having been attached to the word कर्मन् by S I. iv. 49 the use of the word कर्मन् in this sutra is misleading and that the word क्रिया should be substituted for the word कर्मन् in the sutra It is true that Patanjali tries to defend the use of the word कर्मन् in the sutra, but Patanjali's long and elaborate argument itself in defence of the use of the word is its condemnation and shows clearly that the use of the word कर्मन् in S. I. iii 14. is misleading.

4. करण is defined as-साधकतमं करणम्। I. iv. 42 But this definition does not apply to the word करण in S. III. i. 17 (शब्दवैरकलहाभ्रकण्वमेघेभ्यः करणे), where 'करण' means 'क्रिया'.

5. एकवचनं सम्बुद्धिः। II. iii 49

Kasika — आमन्त्रितप्रथमाया यदेकवचनं तत्सम्बुद्धिसंज्ञं भवति।

But this definition does not apply to the word सम्बुद्धि in — एकश्रुति दूरात्सम्बुद्धौ ॥ I ii. 33.

Kasika — दूरात्सम्बोधयति येन वाक्येन तत्संबोधनं संबुद्धिः। नैकवचनं सम्बुद्धिः ॥

Nyasa — संबोधनं सम्बुद्धिरित्यादिना सम्बुद्धिरित्यन्वर्थग्रहणम्। न पारिभाषिकं सम्बुद्धिग्रहणमिति दर्शयति ॥

6 आधारोऽधिकरणम्। I. iv. 45

Kasika· — आध्रियन्तेऽस्मिन्क्रिया इत्याधारः। कर्तृकर्मणोः क्रियाश्रयभूतयो· धारणक्रियां प्रति य आधारस्तत्कारकं अधिकरणसंज्ञं भवति ॥

Siddhanta Kaumudi —कर्तृकर्मद्वारा तन्निष्ठक्रियायाः आधारः कारकमधिकरणसंज्ञं भवति ॥

But this definition does not apply to the word अधिकरण in sutras like अधिकरणैतावत्त्वे च (II. iv. 15), where the word अधिकरण means वर्तिपदार्थ (vide Kāsika on the sutra), and in sutras like पूर्वपरावरोत्तरमेकदेशिनैकाधिकरणे (II ii. 1), अधिकरणविचाले च (IV iii. 43) and विप्रतिषिद्धं चानधिकरणवाचि (II. iv. 13.), where the word अधिकरण means द्रव्य or substance. It is true that the commentators try to bring out all these various senses from the word 'आधार' which is the definition of 'अधिकरण' given in S. I iv 45. But we must remember that the definition occurs in the domain of 'कारके' I. iv 23 and the Kās'ikā and the Kaumudî rightly point out that the word 'आधार' refers only to the कारकाधार.

('इत्संज्ञासूत्रम)

7 चुटू । I. iii 7.

Kasika — चवर्गटवर्गौ प्रत्ययस्यादी इत्संज्ञौ भवतः ॥

वार्तिकम् .— चुन्चुप्चणपोश्चकारप्रतिषेधः ।

भाष्यम् :— चुन्चुपचणपोश्चकारस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। केशचुंचु । वेशचण. ॥

वार्तिकम् .— इदर्थाभावात् सिद्धम् ।

भाष्यम् :— इत्कार्याभावादेतेसंज्ञा न भविष्यति । इदमस्तीत्कार्यम् । चितः अन्त उदात्तो भवतीति अन्तोदात्तत्वं यथा स्यात् ॥

पित्करणमिदानीं किमर्थं स्यात् ।

वार्तिकम् :— पित्करणं किमर्थमिति चेत्पर्यायार्थम् ।

भाष्यम् :— पित्करणं किमर्थमिति चेत्पर्यायार्थमेतत्स्यात् ।

एवं तर्हि यकारादी चुन्चुपचणपौ । किं यकारो न श्रूयते । लुप्तनिर्दिष्टो यकार. ॥

Patanjali s explanation of why the 'च्' is not to be regarded as इत् or indicatory in the two *pratyayas* चुन्चुप् and चणप्, is very unsatisfactory.

8. वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ॥ I. i. 73.

But this definition does not apply to the word वृद्ध in—

वृद्धस्य च पूजायाम् । IV. i. 166.

Kasika:—अपत्यमन्तर्हितं वृद्धमिति शास्त्रान्तरे परिभाषणात् गोत्रं वृद्धमित्युच्यते ।

In his Bhāṣya on S. I. ii 68, Patanjali informs us that "पूर्वसूत्रे गोत्रस्य वृद्धमिति संज्ञा क्रियते ।"

(9) प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं समास उपसर्जनम् । I ii. 43. Siddhānta Kaumudī:— समासशास्त्रे प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं उपसर्जनसंज्ञं स्यात् ।

But this word उपसर्जन is in S IV. i 14 (अनुपसर्जनात्), used in the simple non technical sense of 'apradhāna' or 'not principal'. In this connection the following passage from the Bhāṣya on S. IV. i 14 (अनुपसर्जनात्) is very interesting —

वार्तिकम् :— पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशो वाप्यापिशलमधीत इति ॥

भाष्यम् :— पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशो वा पुनरयं द्रष्टव्यः । पूर्वसूत्रे अप्रधानस्योपसर्जनमिति संज्ञा क्रियते । यावद्ब्रूयात् प्रधानादुत्पन्नस्यमप्रधानादिति तावदनुपसर्जनादिति । किं प्रयोजनम् । आपिशलमधीते ब्राह्मणी । अणन्ताद्डीकारो मा भूदिति ॥

We have the authority of Panini himself for the assertion that the word उपसर्जन was used in the works of पूर्वाचार्यs in the sense of 'अप्रधान' or 'not principal' —

कालोपसर्जने च तुल्यम् । I ii. 57.

Kasika — अविद्यमानमिति वर्तते । कालोपसर्जने चाशिष्ये । कस्मात् । अर्थस्यान्यप्रमाणत्वात् । इहान्ये वैयाकरणाः कालोपसर्जनयोः परिभाषां कुर्वन्ति । ...... तथोपसर्जनपरिभाषां कुर्वन्ति अप्रधानमुपसर्जनमिति । तस्यापि निरासार्थं प्रत्याचष्टे ॥

Conclusion — The Astd. is not unifrom in its use of technical terms.

CHAPTER V

THE USE OF CASES AND OF SYNONYMS, THE NIPĀTANAS AND THE METRICAL SŪTRAS IN THE ASTD

1. *The use of cases*— Let us consider the following sutras from Pāda III, Adhyāya VIII.

निनदीभ्यां स्नातेः कौशले । 89.

Kasika – निनदीत्येताभ्यामुत्तरस्य स्नातिसकारस्य मूर्धन्यादेशो भवति कौशले गम्यमाने । निष्णातः कटकरणे ।

सूत्रं प्रतिष्णातम् । 90

Kasika — प्रतिष्णातमिति निपात्यते । सूत्रं चेद्भवति । प्रतिष्णातं सूत्रम् । शुद्धमित्यर्थः । प्रतिस्नातमित्येवान्यत्र ॥

कपिष्ठलो गोत्रे । 91

Kasika: — कपिष्ठल इति निपात्यते गोत्रविषये ।

प्रष्ठोऽग्रगामिनि । 92.

Kasika:— प्रष्ठ इति निपात्यते अग्रगामिन्यभिधेये ।

वृक्षासनयोर्विष्टरः । 93

Kasika — विष्टर इति निपात्यते वृक्षे आसने च वाच्ये ।

छन्दोनाम्नि च । 94.

Kasika:— विष्टर इति निपात्यते ।

गवियुधिभ्यां स्थिरः । 95.

Kasika:— गवियुधिभ्यामुत्तरस्य स्थिरसकारस्य मूर्धन्यादेशो भवति । गविष्ठिरः । युधिष्ठिरः ।

In the first sutra, the root स्ना which is the कार्यिन् and the स् of which is to be changed to ष् is put in the genitive case, but in the last sutra, the word स्थिरः which is the कार्यिन्

and the स् of which is to be changed to ष्, is put in the nominative case; why is there this discrepancy in the use of cases, of which the above is only an instance, so very prevalent in the Astd.?

2 *The Nipatanas*:— Sutras 90 to 95 (both inclusive) are निपातनs. Why are these sutras put in the form of निपातनs? Could Panini not have written :—

प्रतेः स्नातस्य सूत्रे ।
कपेः स्थलस्य गोत्रे ।
प्रस्थोऽग्रगामिनि ।
वेः स्तरस्य वृक्षासनयो ।

on the analogy of "निनदीभ्यां स्नाते कौशले"? Why should निपातनs intervene between rules expressed in the regular analytic form? And even among the निपातन sutras, there is no uniformity. In S. 90, the word सूत्र which is the वाच्य of the word प्रतिष्णात is put in the nominative case. But in sutra 95, the words वृक्ष and आसन, which are the वाच्य of the word विष्टर are put in the locative case. How to account for all this irregularity?

3 *Metrical Sutras*:— Some sutras in the Astd, taken singly or together with a preceding or following sutra or sutras seem to fall into metre. For example— S. वृद्धिरादैच् I. i. 1. and S. अदेङ्गुण· I. i. 2. read together make 'वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुण' which is a quarter of an अनुष्टुभ् verse

S दिवो द्यावा VI. iii. 29. and S. दिवसश्च पृथिव्याम् VI. iii 30., read together make "दिवो द्यावा दिवसश्च पृथिव्याम् ।" which is the fourth line of a verse, the metre of which is that of the following verse from the Ṛkprātis'ākhaya :—

संहिता पदप्रकृति पदान्तान्
पदादिभिः सन्दधदेति यत्सा ।

कालान्यवायेन स्वरान्तरं तु
विश्रुत्ति सा वा स्वरभक्तिकाला ॥ II 1.

S. इरतेर्हृतिनाथयो· पशौ । II ॥ 25 is a quarter of a verse in the वैतालीय metre.

A thorough search of the whole Astd. will give us many more instances of such metrical sutras But let us consider the three instances given above more closely.

वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुण । In this connection the following remarks of Patanjali on I. 1. I. are interesting:—

अथवा पूर्वोच्चारित· संज्ञी परोच्चारिता संज्ञा । कुत एतत् । सतो हि कार्यिणः कार्येण भवितव्यतम् । तद्यथा—इतरत्रापि सतो मांसपिण्डस्य देवदत्त इति संज्ञा क्रियते ॥ कथं वृद्धिरादैजिति । एतदेकमाचार्यस्य मङ्गलार्थं मृष्यताम् । . . सर्वत्रैव हि व्याकरण पूर्वोच्चारित· संज्ञी, परोच्चारिता संज्ञा 'अदेङ्गुण' इति यथा ॥

Thus S. I. 1. 1 ought to have read आदैज्वृद्धिः, instead of वृद्धिरादैच् Is it possible, pace Patanjali, that the irregularity is caused by the exigencies of metre?

दिवो द्यावा दिवसश्च पृथिव्याम् ।. Why is the word दिवस used and not दिवम् which would have been more correct and easy for comprehension? The Kāsikā (VI. iii. 30) says:— "अकारो· च्चारणं सकारस्य विकाराभावप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् ।" But this end could have been achieved still better by reading the sutra as दिवस्पृथिव्याम् Cf. Candra V ii 97.

दिवस्पृथिव्यां वा ।

वृत्तिः— सकारनिर्देशो रुत्वाभावार्थ. ।

So, it seems, the word दिवस and not दिवम् is used to meet the exigencies of metre.

हरतेर्दृतिनाथयोः पशौ ।

Kasika — दृति नाथ इत्येतयोः कर्मणोरुपपदयोः हरतेर्धातोः पशौ कर्तरि इन् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

Thus 'दृति' and 'नाथ' are उपपद्s. Now consider the following sutras

सुपि स्थः । III. ii 4

Kasika .— सुबन्त उपपदे तिष्ठतेः कप्रत्ययो भवति ।

Here the upapada (सुपि) comes first and then follows the root (स्था) to which the pratyaya is to be added.

तुन्दशोकयोः परिमृजापनुदोः । III. ii 5

Kasika — तुन्दशोकयोः कर्मणोरुपपदयोः परिमृजापनुदोर्धात्वोः कप्रत्ययो भवति ।

Here also the upapadas come first in the sutra and then the roots to which the pratyaya is to be added.

स्तम्बकर्णयो रमिजपोः । III. ii. 13

Here also the upapadas (स्तम्ब and कर्ण) come first and then follow the roots (रम् and जप्)

पुरोऽग्रतोऽग्रेषु सर्तेः । III. i. 18.

The upapadas come first and then comes the root (सृ).

हरतेर्दृतिनाथयोः पशौ । III. ii. 25.

Here the *root* (हृ) *comes first* and then come the upapadas (दृति and नाथ).

नासिकास्तनयोर्ध्माधेटोः । III. ii. 29.

Here the upapadas (नासिका and स्तन) come first and then the roots (ध्मा and धेट्).

Thus it will be seen that S. 'हरतेर्दृतिनाथयोः पशौ' is irregular in its arrangement of the upapada and the root. Is this irregularity caused by the exigencies of metre ?

4 *The synonyms in the Astd.* — In the Astd. the Vedic literature is referred to promiscuously with the words छन्दस्, मन्त्र and निगम and the notion of 'option' is expressed indiscriminately with the words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम्. For 'substance' four words are used: द्रव्य (V. iv. 11) सत्त्व (I. iv 57) अधिकरण (V. iii. 43) and वस्तु (V iv 9). †



† किमेत्तिङव्ययघादाम्वद्रव्यप्रकर्षे ॥ V. iv. 11.
चादयोऽसत्त्वे ॥ I iv 57
Kasika — सत्त्वमिति द्रव्यमुच्यते ।
अधिकरणविचाले च ॥ V. iii 43.
Kasika — अधिकरणं द्रव्यम् ।
जात्यन्ताच्छ बन्धुनि ॥ V. iv. 9.
Kasika — बन्धुशब्देन द्रव्यमुच्यते ।

CHAPTER VI

THE MANDUKAPLUTI THE PARTICLE च AND THE YOGAVIBHĀGA

I

The Mandukapluti·— Let us consider the following three sutras from the first Pāda of the third Adhyāya

सुप आत्मन क्यच् ॥ 8 ॥

Kasika — इषिकर्मण एषितुरात्मसम्बन्धिन सुबन्तादिच्छायामर्थे वा क्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति ।

काम्यच ॥ 9 ॥

Kasika — सुबन्तात्कर्मण आत्मेच्छायां काम्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति । योगविभाग उत्तरत्र क्यचोऽनुवृत्त्यर्थ ॥

उपमानादाचार ॥ 10 ॥

Kasika — क्यजनुवर्तते न काम्यच् । उपमानात्कर्मण सुबन्तादाचारेऽर्थे वा क्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

It will be noticed that in sutra 10, it is क्यच् that is anuvṛtta and not काम्यच्. 'क्यच्' occurs in sutra 8 and 'काम्यच्' in sutra 9. Therefore it is काम्यच् that ought to have been anuvṛtta in sutra 10, and not क्यच्. How to account for this anomaly? The Kāśikā answers thus ·— योगविभाग उत्तरत्र क्यचोऽनुवृत्त्यर्थं । The Nyāsa explaining this says — ननु द्वावप्येतौ क्यच्काम्यचौ सुबन्तात्कर्मण आत्मेच्छायां विधीयेते । तदेकयोग एव कथं न कृत इत्याह—योगविभाग इत्यादि । सुप आत्मन क्यच्काम्यचावित्येकयोगे सत्युत्तरत्र द्वयोरप्यनुवृत्ति स्यात् ॥ ननु च योगविभागेऽपि आनन्तर्यात् काम्यच एवानुवृत्ति स्यात् । न तु क्यच ॥ नैष दोष । चकारोऽत्र क्रियते क्यचोऽनुकर्षणार्थं । तदनुकर्षणमेतत्प्रयोजनम् । उत्तरत्रानुवृत्तिर्यथा स्यात् । इह प्रयोजनाभावात् ॥ काम्यजपि कस्मान्नानुवर्तते इति चेन्न । योगविभागसामर्थ्यात् ॥

इश्च व्रीहिकालयो । [+ ण्युट् and not थकन्]

Now let us see in which of the two triads the anuvrttis are more natural and correct. A little consideration will make it clear that the anuvrttis in the second triad are the more natural and so the correct ones. In the first sutra of the second triad viz. 'गस्थकन्', the prakrti (ग·) and the pratyaya (थकन्) are both given, in the second only the pratyaya (ण्युट्) with the word 'च' added Now what else can the function of 'च' in S. 'ण्युट् च' be, but the anukarsana of the prakrti which is necessary to complete the sense of the sutra (ण्युट् च)? Thus the first sutra tells us that the root 'गै' takes 'थकन्' as an affix denoting agent The next sutra says—'ण्युट् च'. Here only the affix (ण्युट्) is given and so a prakrti is needed to complete the sense Therefore does the Kās'ikā rightly say:— चकारेण ग इत्यनुकृष्यते In the next (third) sutra only the prakrti (ह i. e. the root हा) is given and what is required to complete the sense of the sutra in this case is the pratyaya Therefore does the Kās'ikā on this sutra say:— चकारेण ण्युडनुकृष्यते

Thus it will be seen that by the word 'च' in a sutra, that part of a previous sutra which is needed to complete the sense of the subsequent sutra is inducted. So we may confidently say that the function of 'च' in sutra 'काम्यच् च' is to induct—not 'क्यच्' which is admittedly useless in the sutra (इह प्रयोजनाभावात्, Nyāsa)—but "सुप आत्मन·", which is the prakrti needed by the pratyaya 'काम्यच्', to complete the sense of the sutra.

The form of these triads of sutras can be symbolically represented Let 's' stand for the prakrti or stem and 't' for the pratyaya or the affix. Let the second prtayaya, which with च' forms the second sutra be called 't_1', and the second prak-

rti which occurs in the third sutra be called 's_1' We can represent the form of the two triads of sutras we have just considered and of three other similar triads and their anuvittis thus —

I

Sutras III ı 8 9 10

सुप आत्मन (s) क्यच् (t)	st
काम्यच् (t_1) च [क्यच]	t_1 (t)
उपमानाद् (s_1) आचारे [क्यच्]	s_1 (t)

As explained by the Kasika and the Nyasa

II

Sutras III ı 146 147 148

ग (s) थकन् (t)	st
ण्युट् (t_1) च [ग]	(s) t_1
हश्च (s_1) व्रीहिकालयो [ण्युट्]	s_1 (t_1)

III

Sutras V. ıı. 102 103 104.

तपस्सहस्राभ्या (s) विनिनी (t)	st
अण् (t_1) च [तप सहस्राभ्याम्]	(s) t_1
सिकताशर्कराभ्या (s_1) च [अण्]	s_1 (t_1)

IV

Sutras IV. ıı 27 28, 29

अपानप्त्रपानप्तृभ्या (s) घ (t) ।	st
छ (t_1) च [अपोनप्त्रपानप्तृभ्याम्]	(s) t_1
महेन्द्राद् (s_1) घाणौ (t_2) च [छ]	s_1 t_2 (t_1)

V

Sutras IV ıv 131 132, 133.

पैशीयशभाद्देभंगाद् (s) यत् (t)	st

स (t₁) च [वेशयिशआदेर्भगाद्]	(s) t₁
पूर्वैः (s₁) कृतम् इनयौ (t₂) च [स]	s₁ t₂ (t₁)

It will at once be seen that the first of the above five triads differs in anuvrttis, from the other four. And it has been shown above that the anuvrttis in the second and subsequent triads, which are of the form of st, (s) t_1 s_1 (t_1), are the natural and so the correct ones and not the anuvrttis of the form of st, t_1 (t), s_1 (t), as the Kās'ikā and the Nyāsa on S. काम्यच् च, would have us believe

Compare also the following three sutras from Adhyāya III, Pāda iii —

नपुंसके भावे क्तः । 114.

Kasika:— नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे धातोः क्तः प्रत्ययो भवति। हसितम्। सहसितम् । जल्पितम् ॥

ल्युट् च । 115.

Kasika: — नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे धातोर्ल्युट्प्रत्ययो भवति । हसनं छात्रस्य । शोभनम् । जल्पनम् । शयनम् । आसनम् । योगविभाग उत्तरार्थः ॥

Nyasa — योगविभाग उत्तरार्थ इति । उत्तरत्र ल्युट एवानुवृत्तिर्यथा स्यात्। क्तस्य मा भूत् ।

कर्मणि च येन संस्पर्शात् शरीरसुखम् ॥ 116

Kasika:-येन कर्मणा संस्पृश्यमानस्य कर्तुः शरीरसुखमुत्पद्यते तस्मिन्कर्मण्युपपदे धातोर्नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे ल्युट् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

In this triad of sutras also, it is the affix ल्युट् occurring in the second sutra that is anuvrtta in the third sutra, and not 'क्त' occurring in the first sutra.

If we want the 'काम्यच' triad to conform with the similar triads quoted above, we have to rewrite it as follows :—

सुप आत्मनः (s) काम्यच् (t)	st
क्यच् (t₁) च [सुप आत्मनः]	(s) t₁
उपमानाद् (s₁) आचारे [क्यच्]	s₁ (t₁)

It may be noted that this is the order adopted by Candra in his Vyākarana.

व्याप्यात् काम्यच् ॥ I. 1 23. — st

ससंख्यादमः क्यच्चा ॥ I. 1 24. — (s) t_1

उपमानादाचारे ॥ I. 1. 25. — s_1 (t_2)

Now, to what is this anomaly, which could be remedied by simply re-arranging the sutras, due? Is it due to the later insertion of the sutra 'काम्यच्' in between the two sutras 'सुप आत्मनः क्यच्' and 'उपमानादाचारे'?

Let us now take the three sutras at the end of the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya and consider them.

वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् । 73

त्यदादीनि च । 74.

एङ् प्राचां देशे । 75.

The anuvrttis in this triad can be shown thus:—

वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ॥ 73.

त्यदादीनि च ॥ वृद्धम् ॥ 74

एङ् प्राचां देशे ॥ यस्याचामादि. वृद्धम् ॥ 75.

It will at once be seen that the anuvrtti of "यस्याचामादिः" from S. 73 into S. 75, is anomalous because it is not anuvrtta in S. 74. It (यस्याचामादि) takes a clean leap over S. 74 and comes into S. 75 directly from S. 73 This is anomalous It was seen to be an anomaly by Patanjali and his explanation of it we give below:—

त्यदादीनि च ॥ 74.

भाष्यम् —यस्याचामादिग्रहणमनुवर्तते उताहो न? । किं चात? । यद्यनुवर्तते इह च प्रसज्येत-त्वत्पुत्रस्य छात्राः त्वात्पुत्राः । मात्पुत्रा. । इह च न स्यात्-त्वदीयो मदीय इति ॥ अथ निवृत्तम्, "एङ् प्राचां देशे" यस्याचामादिग्रहणं

कर्तव्यम् ॥ यत् तर्ह्यनुवर्तते । कथं त्वत्पुत्रा मत्पुत्रा इति? । सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते— "वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम्" । "त्यदादीनि च" वृद्धसंज्ञानि भवन्ति, वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ॥ "एङ् प्राचां देशे" यस्याचामादिग्रहणमनुवर्तते, वृद्धिग्रहणं निवृत्तम् । तद्यथा— कश्चित्कान्तारे समुपस्थिते सार्थमुपादत्ते स यदा निष्क्रान्तकान्तारो भवति तदा सार्थं जहाति ॥

(प्रदीप) सम्बन्धमिति । द्विर्नीयतमेतत् । सम्बन्धमनुवर्त्स्यते न ह्यन्यनीत्यर्थः ॥ अथवा सम्बध्यत इति सम्बन्धम् । कर्मणि घञ् नपुंसकेऽपि वाचकाभावा द्रष्टानि । वृद्धिग्रहणमस्वद्धमादिग्रहणमिहानुवर्तत इति नास्ति तस्य त्यदादिभिः सम्बन्धः ॥

It will be seen that the whole expanation is based on the analogy of 'the Man crossing the Forest and the Caravan' which, it need hardly be said is not at all satisfactory.

Kaiyata says— वृद्धिग्रहणमस्वद्धमादिग्रहणमिहानुवर्तत इति नास्ति तस्य त्यदादिभिः सम्बन्धः ॥ To say that a word 'अनुवर्तते' from a preceding into a following sutra and yet does not get connected with the following sutra, is a contradiction in terms The essential characteristic of 'अनुवृत्ति', is that a portion of a previous sutra is inducted into a subsequent sutra and forms one complete sentence with the subsequent sutra (एकवाक्यता मापद्यते) So if there is an 'anuvṛtti' of a word or words from a previous into a subsequent sutra, that word or words must form an एकवाक्य with the subsequent sutra. There is no other way.

On a little consideration it will be seen that all this difficulty could have been avoided simply by arranging the sutras thus —

वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ।
एङ् प्राचां देशे । [यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम्]
त्यदादीनि च । [वृद्धम्]

This arrangement does not offend against the paribhāṣā "चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र", whereas the present order of the sutras does offend.

Now, how can we explain the fact that an anomaly which could be remedied by such slight rearrangement of the sutras has been allowed to remain there in the Astd.? If the author of all the three sutras were one and the same, and wrote all the three sutras at one and the same time, then why did he not arrange the sutras in the order indicated above, which would have raised no difficulty? Our explanation is that originally the Pāda ended with S त्यदादीनि च and that S एङ्-प्राचां देशे was added later.

Of such anomalous anuvṛttis, various explanations—explanations sometimes based on mere fanciful analogies and invented to meet the particular occasion are given. And fortunately for us, all of them occur in the Bhāṣya on S I. i. 3. We shall examine that portion of the Bhāṣya on S. I. i. 3, which deals with the 'anuvṛttis' and see whether Patanjali himself was satisfied with the सम्बन्धानुवर्तन explanation or with the मण्डूकप्लुति explanation which is such a favourite with the later commentators.

इको गुणवृद्धी ॥ I. i. 3.

भाष्यम्—यदीग्ग्रहणं क्रियते, द्यौः, पन्थाः, सः, इममिति एतेऽपि इकः प्राप्नुवन्ति ।

वार्तिकम्—संज्ञया विधाने नियमः ।

भाष्यम्—संज्ञया ये विधीयन्ते तेषु नियमः ।[1] किं वक्तव्यमेतत् । नहि । कथमनुच्यमानं गस्यते ? । गुणवृद्धिग्रहणसामर्थ्यात् । कथं पुनरन्तरेण गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमिको गुणवृद्धी स्याताम् ? । प्रकृतं गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमनुवर्तते । क्व प्रकृतम् ? । वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुण इति । यदि तदनुवर्तते "अदेङ्गुणो वृद्धिश्च" इत्यदेङां वृद्धिसंज्ञापि प्राप्नोति ॥

1. सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते—"वृद्धिरादैच्" । "अदेङ्गुणः" इति वृद्धिरादैच् । ततः—"इको गुणवृद्धी" इति गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमनुवर्तते, आदैजदेङ्ग्रहणं निवृत्तम् ॥

2 अथवा मण्डूकगतयोऽधिकाराः । यथा मण्डूका उत्प्लुत्योत्प्लुत्य गच्छन्ति तद्वदधिकाराः ॥

3. अथवैकयोग- करिष्यते-" वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुणः" ततः "इको गुणवृद्धी" इति । न चैकयोगेऽनुवृत्तिर्भवति ॥

4. अथवा—"अन्यवचनाचकाराकरणाच्च प्रकृतापवादो विज्ञायते, यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्यापवादो बाधको भवति" ॥

अन्यस्याः संज्ञाया वचनाच्चकारस्य चानुकर्षणार्थस्याकरणात् प्रकृताया वृद्धिसंज्ञाया गुणसंज्ञा बाधिका भविष्यति । यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्यापवादो बाधको भवति ॥

5 अथवा वक्ष्यत्येतद्—" अनुवर्तन्ते च नाम विधय- । न चानुवर्तनादेव भवन्ति । किं तर्हि ? । यत्नाद् भवन्ति " इति ॥

6 अथवा— उभयं निवृत्तम् । तदपेक्षिष्यामहे ॥

Patanjali here gives six explanations of the anomalous anuvrtti of "वृद्धिः" from the first to the third sutra From this we can say that Patanjali himself was not satisfied with the सम्बन्धानुवर्तन and the मण्डूकप्लुति explanations. The first explanation which Patanjali offers us is : सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते. Patanjali not being satisfied with this gives a second explanation—मण्डूकगतयोऽधिकाराः।. This explanation also not satisfying him he offers us four others In the Bhāsya itself it is said that a second explanation is given, where the first is not in the opinion of the author satisfactory.† And so says Kumārila also—

सर्वव्याख्याविकल्पानां द्वयमेव प्रयोजनम् ।
पूर्वत्रापरितोषो वा विषयव्याप्तिरेव वा ॥ ‡

And one of the Mīmāmsā rules of interpretation lays it down that whenever several explanations are given by the

† अपरितुष्यन् खल्वपि भवाननेन परिहारेण 'अनाकृतिलिङ्गेन वा' इत्याह । Bhasya on S. I i 1.

‡ Jaimini's Mimamsa Sutras, Anand. Edition Vol. I p 186.

author in successive clauses, it is only the last that is to be taken as the one approved of by the author * And as Patanjali offers us four explanations after the Mandūkapluti explanation, and five after the Sambandhānuvartana explanation it is clear that he was satisfied with neither the Sambandhānuvartana nor the Mandūkapluti explanations he resorted to them only as an "अगतिका गति ", a counsel of despair The Laghus'abdendus'ekhara on S विरामोऽवसानम् I iv 110 says — सत्यामुपपत्तौ मण्डूकप्लुत्याश्रयणस्यायुक्तत्वात् I.

II

The Particle च — We find in the Paribhāsendus'ekhara the Paribhasā— चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र. This is not one of the Paribhāsās, expressly laid down in the Astd. but in the words of the Paribhāsendus'ekhara, "चानुकृष्टमनुवर्तमाने 'अन्यथैवंकथम्' (III. iv 59) इति सूत्रे पुनर्ग्रहणमस्या ज्ञापकम् I".

Under 'च', Apte in his Dictionary says A particle expressing I. Copulation used to join words or assertions together. In this sense it is used with each of the words or assertions which it joins together, or it is used after the last of the words or assertions so joined . " Now the use of 'च' with each of the assertions which it joins together is unthinkable in the Astd, because its use with only the last assertion serves the purpose as well, and it is well known that अर्धमात्रालाघवेन पुत्रोत्सवं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः I So if 'च' is at all used in the sutras it must be with the last of the assertions and we expect the Adhikāra to end with the assertion. So "चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र" *lays down not so much an artificial Paribhasa of the Vyakaranasastra as a rule which governs the structure of a Sanskrit sentence* Let us consider the following sutras from the first Pada of the first Adhyaya

* Vide Maine s Hindu Law Eighth Edition p. 36

ईदूदेद् द्विवचनं प्रगृह्यम् ॥ ११ ॥
अदसो मात् ॥ १२ ॥ ईदूदेत्, प्रगृह्यम् ॥
शे ॥ १३ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
निपात एकाजनाङ् ॥ १४ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
ओत् ॥ १५ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
सम्बुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे ॥ १६ ॥ ओत्, प्रगृह्यम् ॥
उञ ऊँ ॥ १७, १८ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
ईदूतौ च सप्तम्यर्थे ॥ १९ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
दाधा घ्वदाप् ॥ २० ॥

It will be seen that sutras 11 to 19 are assertions about 'प्रगृह्यम्' and that 'च' is used with the last assertion. Thus we see that the 'प्रगृह्य' adhikāra ends with S. 19, into which the word 'प्रगृह्यम्' is inducted from S. 11 by a 'च', the word 'प्रगृह्यम्' passing through all the sutras between S. 11 and S. 19 and being connected with each of them on its way *from* S 11 to S 19. With S. 19 the Pragṛhyādhikāra ends, and S. 20 speaks about the 'घु' verbs The word 'प्रगृह्यम्' which is drawn into S. 19 from S 11, by the word च, does not further proceed to S 20. Thus we arrive at the rule : चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र If any sutra about 'प्रगृह्यम्' had come after S 19, that sutra would have to be regarded as perhaps a later addition

So whenever a 'च' occurs in a sutra we expect the sutra to be the last of the assertions about something, *i e*, we expect the sutra to stand at the end of an adhikāra, or in other words, we expect the anuvṛtti of some word to end with it.

This is supported by the Bhāṣya also. Patanjali on S I i 48 (षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा) says:—

अधिकारो नाम त्रिप्रकारः ॥ कश्चिदेकदेशस्थः सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति, यथा प्रदीपः सुप्रज्वालितः सर्वं वेश्माभिज्वलयति ॥ अपरोऽधिकारो यथा रज्वा

ऽयसा वा बद्ध काष्ठमनुकृष्यते तद्वदनुकृष्यते चकारेण ॥ अपराधिकार प्रतियोग तस्य निर्देशार्थं इति योग योग उपतिष्ठते ॥

Of these tl ree kinds of Adhikaras spoken of by Patanjali we are here concerned only with the second अपरा धिकार यथा रज्ज्वा अयसा वा बद्ध काष्ठमनुकृष्यते तद्वदनुकृष्यते चकारेण । Now if an अधिकृत word (अधिकार) is drawn towards a sutra by a 'च' just l ke a piece of wood t ed to a piece of rope or iron (chain) and drawn towards oneself then it is clear that the word so drawn by a 'च' into a sutra should not go into the next sutra because the function of च is only o attract the अधिकृत word to the sutra in which it (च) occurs, and not to push it on into the next sutra चानुकृष्ट नोत्तरत्र

But there occ ır n the Astd many cases where the rule 'चानुकृष्ट नोत्तरत्र is r ot observed This is seems to have greatly puzzled Patanjal so much so that in his Bha ya on लुटि च क्लृप (I ıı 93) he propo es to str ke off all the anuvrttya rtha 'च s from the Astd

लुटि च क्लृप ॥ I ıı 93

भाष्यम — किमर्थ श्चकार । स्यसनावित्येतदनुकृष्यते । यदि तर्हि नान्तरेण चकारमनुवृत्तिर्भवति शुद्भ्यो लुङ इत्यत्रापि चकार कर्तव्य । विभाषेत्यनुकर्षणार्थ । अथदानीमन्तरेणापि चकारमनुवृत्तिर्भवति, इहापि नार्थश्चकारेण । सर्वे चकारा प्रत्याख्यायन्ते । *

उद्योत — सर्वे चकारा इति । अनुवृत्तिफलका इत्यर्थ ॥

---

* But compare per contra —

लुटि च क्लृप ॥ I ııı 93

Kasika —वृताद्भ्यो स्यसनोरित्येव सिद्ध । लुटि विधीयते । चकार स्तर्हि स्यसनोरनुकर्षणार्थों न वक्तव्य । एव तर्हि इय प्राप्ति पूर्वां प्राप्तिं बाधेत । तस्माच्चकार स्यसनोरनुकर्षणार्थ क्रियते । लुटि च स्यसनोश्च क्लृप परस्मैपद वा भवति ॥

It need hardly be said that Patanjali's proposal to drop all the anuvṛttyartha 'च's from the Astd. is unscientific. अर्धमात्रालाघवेन पुत्रोत्सवं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः, and it is inconceivable that there should be so many useless 'च's in the Astd. As Patanjali has himself observed in his Bhāṣya on S I. 1 1, "प्रमाणभूत आचार्यो दर्भपवित्रपाणि शुचावकाशे प्राङ्मुख उपविश्य महता प्रयत्नेन सूत्राणि प्रणयति स्म। तत्राशक्यं वर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन भवितुम् ॥". So we ought not to drop the 'च's but try to understand them.

Let us *consider* the following three *sutras* at the end of the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya

वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ॥ ७३ ॥
त्यदादीनि च ॥ ७४ ॥ वृद्धम् ॥
एङ् प्राचां देशे ॥ ७५ ॥ वृद्धम् ॥

It will be seen that the word वृद्धम्, though drawn into S. 74 from S. 73 by a 'च', yet proceeds to S. 75. Here is an exception to the rule— चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र Patanjali would have the 'च' dropped from S 74. But it is not right to delete the 'च we have to understand it We think that originally there were only two sutras about 'वृद्ध', viz S. वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम and S. त्यदादीनि च. The 'च' in S. 'त्यदादीनि च' indicates this. S 'एङ् प्राचां देशे' is a later addition Are all the infractions of the Paribhāṣā 'चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र' due to later additions of sutras?

III

The Yogavibhaga :— One who takes up a printed copy of the Astd or even a manuscript two or three hundred years old, will find that every sutra is separately written and in the printed texts numbered. But one would be committing a serious mistake if one were to suppose that Panini originally gave us his sutras in this way. For instance, in any printed copy of the Astd, we find sutras 'वृद्धिरादैच्' and 'अदेङ्गुण'

printed and numbered separately. But Panini himself did not give us his sutras thus separated one from the other, but he gave us them in the संहितापाठ, thus :— वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुण इको-गुणवृद्धी etc.* But he taught his pupils how to separate them from each other, and in most cases it is not very difficult to do so. Every sutra or yoga is a sentence— elliptical it may be—and can easily be separated from the rest. This breaking up of the संहितापाठ into its component sutras is called योगविभाग-योगानां सूत्राणां विभागो विभजनम्। This kind of Yogavibhāga should be distinguished from the one which is sometimes advocated by Kātyāyana and Patanjali, where one single sutra (योग) is split up into more than one sutras, to cover facts of language, which most probably escaped the notice of Panini and for which he did not intend to provide †

There is yet a third kind of योगविभाग, where the Astd has two consecutive sutras mostly connected with a 'च', when the two sutras could have been combined into one single sutra. We often read in the Kās'ikā — "किमर्थो योगविभाग.? योगविभाग उत्तरार्थः।" "किमर्थो योगविभागः? यथासंख्यनिवारणार्थो योगविभागः॥" The question is: Why has the Astd two sutras instead of one? why is there योगविभाग? could not the two

* Cf. "यदि भसंज्ञा, 'वृद्धिरादैजदेङ्गुण.' इति जश्त्वमपि न प्राप्नोति"।
Bhasya on S I i. 1.

Also Bhasya on S स्थानेन्तरतम. I I. i 49.

यथा पुनरियमन्तरतमनिर्वृत्तिः, सा किं प्रकृतितो भवति—स्थानिन्यन्तरतमे षष्ठीति। आहोस्विदादेशत -स्थाने प्राप्यमाणानामन्तरतम आदेशो भवतीति॥ कुत. पुनरियं विचारणा?। उभयथा हि तुल्या संहिता "स्थानेन्तरतम उरण्रपर:" इति॥

उद्योत — अनेन संहितापाठ एव पूर्वं स्थित इत्युक्तम्।

† Cf Bhasya on S. ऊम उँ' (I i. 17) and on S 'प्रादय उपसर्गा.' (I. iv. 54) and the note by the उाधिमथ on them in N. S. Edition

sutras be with advantage combined into one single sutra?' The question is almost always answered thus — 'योगविभाग उत्तरार्थ ।' 'यथासंख्यनिवारणार्थो योगविभाग.' ॥. It is this third kind of Yogavibhāga, that we are here concerned with. Let us consider the following sutras—

द्वित्रिपूर्वान्निष्कात् ॥ V. 1 30. ॥ विभाषा लुक् ॥

बिस्ताच्च ॥ 31. ॥ विभाषा लुक् ॥ '

विंशतिकात्खः ॥ 32 ॥

Why is there योगविभाग between sutras 30 and 31? Could not the two sutras have been combined into a single sutra—द्वित्रिपूर्वाभ्यां निष्कबिस्ताभ्याम्, or better still द्वित्रिपूर्वान्निष्कबिस्तात् ।? The answer is in the negative. If the two sutras were to be combined into one, then the paribhāṣā "यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्" would have applied and the meaning of the sutra would have been—There is optional (vibhāṣā) लुक्, of the आर्हीय affix added to 'निष्क' preceded by 'द्वि', and to 'बिस्त' preceded by 'त्रि'. But the author of the sutra wanted that there should be optional लुक् of the आर्हीय affix even when it was added to 'निष्क' preceded by 'त्रि' and to 'बिस्त' preceded by 'द्वि'. In order to accomplish this he had to evade the यथासंख्य paribhāṣā and this he could do only by योगविभाग, by writing two sutras—द्वित्रिपूर्वान्निष्कात् and बिस्ताच्च.

Let us take another group of sutras —

गस्थकन् ॥ III 1 146

Kasikā—गायतेः थकन् प्रत्ययो भवति शिल्पिनि कर्तरि । गाथकः । गाथिका ।

ण्युट् च ॥ 147.

Kasika —चकारेण न इत्यनुकृष्यते । गायतेर्ण्युट् प्रत्ययो भवति शिल्पिनि कर्तरि । गायनः, गायनी । <u>योगविभाग उत्तरार्थः</u> ॥

Nyasa–योगविभाग उत्तरार्थं इति। उत्तरत्र चकारेण ण्युट एवानुवृत्तिर्यथा स्यात्। यत्नो मा भूदिति। यो ण्युड्यत्नावित्येकयोगे यत्नस्याप्यनुवृत्तिः स्यात्।

दृश धीद्विरल्पयो॰ ॥ 148.

Kasika—चकारेण ण्युडनुवर्तते। अहानेर्जिहीतेश्च धात्वोर्ण्युट् प्रत्ययो भवति।

Here the author of the sutras could have combined SS 146 and 147, into one sutra, यो ण्युड्यत्नौ But he has not done so because he wanted that ण्युट् only, and not यत्न् also, should be inducted into S. 148. The point is made quite clear in the Kās'ikā and the Nyāsa on S. 147.

Let us take another example from Pāda iii, Adhyāya IV. श्रविष्ठाफल्गुन्यनुराधास्वातितिष्यपुनर्वसुहस्तविशाखाषाढाबहुलाल्लुक् ॥34 स्थानान्तगोशालखरशालाच्च ॥ 35.

Why is there the Yogavibhāga here? Here there is no possibility of the application of the Yathāsankhya paribhāṣā, nor is the anuvṛtti of 'स्थानान्तगोशालखरशालात्' required in the next sutra. The Kās'ikā does not give any reason for the Yogavibhāga, nor does the Nyāsa. The Kaumudī is silent on the point The author of the sutras here seems to have resorted to the Yogavibhāga, because it would be rather awkward to speak of such bright celestial objects as the S'ravisthā etc and of such earthly things as an ass or mule shed, in the same breath, though elsewhere he does not scruple to speak of श्वन् and मघवन्, in one and the same sutra. Another reason for the Yogavibhāga might be that if the two sutras were to be combined into one, then the resulting sutra would be too cumbrous. But compare S VII. iv. 65 दाधर्तिदर्धर्तिदर्धर्षिबोभूतु तेतिक्तेऽलर्ष्यापनीफणत्संसनिष्यदत्करिक्रत्कनिक्रदद्भरिभ्रद्दविध्वतोदविद्युतत्तरि- त्रतः सरीसृपतंवरीवृजन्मर्मृज्यागनीगन्तीति च ॥.

Let us consider another case of Yogavibhāga

4 प्रजोरिनिः ॥ III. ii. 156.

Kasika — प्रपूर्वाज्जवतेः तच्छीलादिषु कर्तृषु इनिः प्रत्ययो भवति। प्रजवी प्रजविनौ ॥

जिदृक्षिविश्रीण्वमाव्यथाभ्यमपरिभूप्रसूभ्यश्च ॥ 157.

Kasika:— जिप्रभृतिभ्यो धातुभ्यः इनिः प्रत्ययो भवति तच्छीलादिषु कर्तृषु ॥

Here at last we have a case where no reason has been ascribed for the Yogavibhāga. One may be tempted to say that S. 156 deals with an upasr*sta root (प्र जु), whereas S. 157 deals with anupasr*sta roots, and so there is Yogavibhāga. But it cannot be so said There are upasr*sta roots (विश्री अभ्यम, परिभू, प्रसू) in S 157 also There is absolutely no question here of the Yathāsankhya rule or of 'उत्तरपादवृत्ति'. So no reason can be assigned to the Yogavibhāga between sutras 156 and 157. Then what is the Yogavibhāga due to? How to explain the Yogavibhāga ? We think that originally the Sūtrakāra wrote *only* S. 156 (प्रजोरिनिः) and that S. 157, is an addition by a later Ācārya Thus the author of S. 156 is not the same as that of S. 157. Sutra 156 is by an earlier Ācārya, and sutra 157 by a later.

It may be said in the words of Patanjali, "पुरस्तादिदमाचार्येण दृष्टं 'प्रजोरिनिः' इति। तत्पठितम् ॥ ततः उत्तरकालमिदं दृष्टं 'जिदृ०' इति। तदपि पठितम् ॥ न चेदानीमाचार्याः सूत्राणि कृत्वा निवर्तयन्ति " § and that Ss. 156 and 157 are written by the same Ācārya but at different times But even so, it is admitted that when the Ācārya wrote " प्रजु takes the affix इनि ", he was

§ Cf. पुरस्तादिदमाचार्येण दृष्टम्। 'भवेच नाह्रिक' इति। तत्पठितम्। ततः उत्तरकालमिदं दृष्टम्। 'प्रोत्साहयश्च नर्दिनाः' इति। तदपि पठितम्। न चेदानीमाचार्याः सूत्राणि कृत्वा निवर्तयन्ति। Paspaśā.

not conscious of the fact that roots जि etc. also take the same affix (तत उत्तरस्यापीदं दृश्यम्). So he must have added S 157 after a considerable lapse of time, after going through the whole of the then available literature to see what other roots than प्रजु take the affix इनि This is possible, but highly improbable. It must be remembered that "प्रमाणभूत आचार्यो दर्भपवित्रपाणिः शुचाववकाशे प्राङ्मुख उपविश्य महता प्रयत्नेन सूत्राणि प्रणयति स्म." Therefore, it is not likely that he wrote S. प्रजोरिनिः, without thoroghly searching the whole literature available to him for roots taking the affix इनि, the more so, because he knew, that once he composed a sutra he could not go back upon it (न चेदानीमाचार्याः सूत्राणि कृत्वा निवर्तयन्ति) And if he could not find in his first thorough search of literature, that some roots other than प्रजु also take the affix इनि, it is most unlikely that a second search should reveal them to him It is more reasonable to suppose that a subsequent Ācārya —to whom litertnre that was not available to the prior Ācārya who wrote S 156, was available —composed S 157 and inserted it in the proper place.

Conclusion :—The Mandūkapluti, the चानुकृष्टस्योत्तरत्रानुवृत्ति, and the useless Yogavibhāga, indicate sutras that have been added later to an already existing book of sutras.

It is to be noted that the word उपदेश in S I. iii. 2. must be taken to include the Gaṇapātha. Otherwise, it would be difficult to give the name of इत्s to the consonants at the end of many of the prātipadikas in the Gaṇapātha. Thus 'ट्' in 'नदट्' 'चोरट्' etc., occurring in the Gaṇapātha cannot be called an इत्, unless it be held that S. हलन्त्यम् applies to the Gaṇapātha. And S हलन्त्यम् applies only to the उपदेश.

Now, this fact that by the word उपदेश, which is anuvṛtta from S उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत्, into S. हलन्त्यम्,—Panini, the author of the Astd., refers to the Ganapātha is very significant. It shows that Panini received the whole of the Gaṇapātha from his predecessors as उपदेश; because, in the words of Nagoji Bhatta, 'उपदेश इत्युक्ते गुरुकर्तृकतायाः स्वरसतः प्रतीतेः' ।.*

Let us consider the following two sutras.

उगवादिभ्यो यत् । V. i. 2

Kasika.—प्राक् क्रीतादित्येव। उवर्णान्तात् प्रातिपदिकाद्, गवादिभ्यश्च यत् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥.... ..गो। हविस्। बर्हिस्।.... (ग. सू.) नाभि नभं च। (ग. सू.) शुनः सम्प्रसारणं वा च दीर्घत्वं तत्संनियोगेन चान्तोदात्तत्वम् ॥ (ग. सू.) ऊधसोऽनङ् च ॥. ....कूप........... विष ॥ गवादिः ॥

It will be seen that the गवादिगण contains three Gaṇasūtras.

कम्बलाच्च संज्ञायाम् ॥ V. i 3.

Kasika—कम्बलात् प्राक् क्रीतीयेष्वर्थेषु यत्प्रत्ययो भवति छस्यापवादः संज्ञाया विषये ॥

Now a very important question is raised by the Nyāsa, and answered thus:—

अथ गवादिष्वेव कम्बलाच्च संज्ञायामिति कस्मान्न पठति ?। तत्र पाठे न कश्चिद् गुरुलाघवकृतो विशेष इति यत्किंचिदेतदिति ॥

---

* Uddyota, on Paspasa on Vartika —वृत्तिसमवायार्थ उपदेशः ।. Nirnaya Sagara Edition (1917) p. 73.

We submit there is certainly some 'विशेष'. If the sutra कंबलाच संज्ञायाम्, had been included in the Gaṇapātha, then, the Sūtrapātha would have been shorter by twelve whole मात्राs, moreover, there is no reason why "नाभि नभं च" "शुनः संप्रसारणं वा च दीर्घत्वं तत्सन्नियोगेन चान्तोदात्तत्वम्" and "ऊधसोऽनङ् च" should be put in the Gaṇapātha as Ganasūtras, and why "कम्बलाच्च संज्ञायाम्" which also could have been included in the गवादिगण as a Gaṇasūtra, should be put in the Astd. as a sutra of the Sūtrapātha. This is unmethodical. We think the true explanation is that Panini got both S V. 1. 2. and the गवादिगण attached to it from his Ācāryas as उपदेश and so being unwilling to tamper with the text of the गवादिगण, put S. "कम्बलाच्च संज्ञायाम्" in the Sūtrapātha.

In this connection, the Bhāṣya on S. I. 1. 34. is very important and let us turn to it

पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम् ॥ I. 1 34.

वार्तिकम्.— अवरादीनां च पुनः सूत्रपाठे ग्रहणानर्थक्यं गणे पठितत्वात् ॥

From this Vārtika it is clear that Kātyāyana held that the Ganapātha preceded the Sūtrapatha or Astādhyāyī in point of time.

(गणपाठसूत्रपाठयोः कालनिर्णयाधिकरणम्)

भाष्यम्:— अवरादीनां च पुनः सूत्रपाठे ग्रहणमनर्थकम् । किं कारणम् । गणे पठितत्वात् । गणे ह्येतानि पठ्यन्ते ॥ कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते—स पूर्वः पाठ., अयं पुनः पाठ इति ?। तानि हि पूर्वादीनि, इमान्यवरादीनि ॥

प्रदीपः— तेन पूर्वं गणपाठ. पश्चात्सूत्रपाठ इत्यर्थः ॥

भाष्यम्.— इमान्यपि पूर्वादीनि ॥ एवं तर्हि आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति—'स पूर्वः पाठ., अयं पुनः पाठः' इति । यदयं "पूर्वादिभ्यो नवभ्यो वा" इति नवग्रहणं करोति । नवैव हि पूर्वादीनि ॥

प्रदीप·— नवग्रहणमिति । तत्र हि नवग्रहणं त्यदादीनां निरासार्थं क्रियते । यदि च नियतसंनिवेशो गणपाठ पूर्व., ततोऽधिकव्यवच्छेदाय नवग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्॥

उद्योत — नैवैतेति भाष्ये । अष्टाध्याय्या पूर्वेत्यादिसूत्रपठितानि इत्यर्थ । अष्टाध्याय्या पूर्वशब्दत्वे पूर्वादीनीति सूत्रे अष्टाध्यायीसूत्रपठितानामेव तेषा ग्रहण स्यादिति भाव ॥

In this passage of the Bhāṣya, Patanjali has established that the Ganapātha preceded the Astd in point of time

(सूत्रप्रयोजनाधिकरणम्)

1 भाष्यम् —इद तर्हि प्रयोजनम्–व्यवस्थायामसज्ञायामिति वक्ष्यामीति । एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । एतन्निदिष्टान्यपरैतानि गणे पठ्यन्ते ॥

2 इद तर्हि प्रयोजनम्–त्यादिपर्युदासेन पर्युदासो मा भूदिति ॥

प्रदीप –त्यादिपर्युदासेनेति । त्यदादीनि पठित्वा गणे कैश्चित्पूर्वादीनि पठितानि । तत्राद्यादिभ्य इति तसिलादीना प्रतिषेध प्राप्नोति । तत्र पुन सर्वनामसज्ञा तसिलादिविधानार्थं विधीयते । तेन त्यादिपर्युदासो बाध्यते ॥

भाष्यम्—एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति–नैषा त्यादि पर्युदासेन पर्युदासो भवतीति । यदय पूर्वत्रासिद्धमिति निपातन करोति । वार्तिक कारश्च पठति "जश्भावादिति चेदुत्तरत्राभावादप्रसग " इति ॥

3 इद तर्हि प्रयोजन जसि विभाषा वक्ष्यामीति ॥

Let us consider the second of the above three Prayojanas. The सर्वादिगण, as we have it at present reads*—

सर्व विश्व उभ उभय डतर डतम अन्य अन्यतर इतर त्वत् त्व नेम सम सिम । पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसज्ञायाम् । स्वमज्ञातिधना ख्यायाम् । अन्तर बहिर्योगोपसव्यानयो । त्यद् तद् यद् एतद् इदम् अदस् एक द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम् ॥ सर्वादि ॥

But Patanjali when he says— "इद तर्हि प्रयोजनम्—त्यादिपर्युदासेन पर्युदासो मा भूदिति", refers to a second version of the सर्वादि गण which read —

सर्व विश्व उभ उभय डतर डतम अन्य अन्यतर इतर त्वत् त्व नेम सम सिम त्यद् तद् यद् एतद् इदम् अदस् एक द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम् । पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसज्ञायाम् । स्वमज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम् । अन्तर बहिर्योगोपसव्यानयो ॥ सर्वादि ॥ (Vide प्रदीप)

It will be seen that the Dvyādis, that is, the word द्वि and the words coming after it in the Gana, according to the first version, are:- द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु and किम्; whereas, according to the second version, they are:— द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम्। पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापरापराणि व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम्। स्वमज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम्। and अन्तरं बहिर्योगोपसंव्यानयोः।.

Now let us turn to S V. iii. 2.

किंसर्वनामबहुभ्योऽद्व्यादिभ्यः॥

Kasika.— प्राग्दिश इत्येव। किमः सर्वनाम्नो बहुशब्दाच्च प्राग्दिशः प्रत्यया वेदितव्याः। सर्वनामत्वात्प्राप्ते ग्रहणं द्व्यादिपर्युदासः क्रियते। ...अद्व्यादिभ्य इति किम्? । द्वाभ्याम्, द्वयोः॥

Thus, a प्राग्दिशीय termination is not to be added to a 'Dvyādi' word (अद्व्यादिभ्यः). Now, as we have seen, the words पूर्व पर अवर दक्षिण उत्तर अपर अ़वर (व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम्) स्व (अज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम्) and अन्तर (बहिर्योगोपसंव्यानयोः), are Dvyādis' according to the second version of the सर्वादिगण. Then, how can we get forms like पूर्वत्र and उत्तरत्र? 'त्रल्' is a प्राग्दिशीय termination; and the words पूर्व and उत्तर are 'Dvyādis' according to the second version of the सर्वादिगण; therefore, अद्व्यादिभ्यः इति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति।. To remove this 'द्व्यादिपर्युदासेन पर्युदासः' difficulty caused by the second version of the सर्वादिगण—so it is urged—is the purpose (प्रयोजन) of S I. i. 34. (पूर्वपरावर०): इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनं—द्व्यादिपर्युदासेन पर्युदासो मा भूदिति।. *

Though this 'Prayojana' or purpose for the sutra (I i 34) is not accepted by Patanjali, who gets over the द्व्यादिपर्युदास difficulty by means of the आचार्यप्रवृत्ति, —yet, the very fact that it is advanced at all, is very significant. It clearly shows that the author of the Astd is not the author of the सर्वादिगण, and that it existed already before his time in two versions. If the

* Vide the प्रदीप quoted above on this point

author of the Astd. were also the author of the सर्वादिगण, then, he would have given us only that version of the सर्वादिगण, which does not give rise to the स्यादिस्युंदास difficulty.

If the सर्वादिगण pre existed Panini, the author of the Astd., then the sutras 1. पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम्, 2. स्वमज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम्, and 3. अन्तरं बहिर्योगोपसंव्यानयोः, which occur in the सर्वादिगण as गणसूत्र, must also be pre-Paninian. Panini borrowed the three sutras from the Gaṇapātha and incorporated them in his Astd., as SS. I. i. 34, 35, and 36.

We here witness a peculiar phenomenon. First, we have the sutra सर्वादीनि सर्वनामानि. To it is attached the सर्वादिगण. The gaṇa contains the Gaṇasūtras— "पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम्" "स्वमज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम्" and "अन्तरं बहिर्योगोपसंव्यानयोः". These are taken into the Sūtrapātha or the Astd. Thus it is clear that some Gaṇasūtras were sometimes turned into the Astd sutras. Thus 'दघमाटनेट् च' is a Gaṇasūtra occurring in the गवादिगण, attached to S. V. I. 2, but it also appears in the Astd. as S. V. iv. 13 These are cases where Gaṇasūtras have been turned into the Astd. sutras. In some cases धातुगणसूत्रs have served as the basis of some Astd. sutras. Commenting on S. III. i. 21 the Nyāsa says:— प्रातिपदिकाद् धात्वर्थे बहुलमिष्ठवच्च (धा. सू.) इत्यनेन मुण्डादिभ्यः सिद्धे णिच् । अयं च तस्यैव प्रपञ्चः । *And again, four sutras later, on S 25, the Nyāsa says* — पुरादिभ्योऽन्येषामिह ग्रहणं प्रपञ्चार्थम् । 'प्रातिपदिकाद् धात्वर्थे' इति सिद्धत्वात् । Here we see a धातुगणसूत्र forming the basis of the Astd. sutras III i. 21 and 25

Thus we have seen that Panini, the author of the Astd. received both the Gaṇapātha and the Dhātupātha (see Chapter II) from his Ācāryas as क्रमेण.

The Gaṇapātha seems, however, not to have been held so unchangeable and sacred as the पञ्चपाठ. Successive Ācāryas

seem to have made changes in the Ganapātha *This is due* mainly to the fundamental difference between the words contained in the धातुपाठ and those contained in the गणपाठ The गणपाठ consists of nouns—and many of these are names of persons, families, tribes, countries and towns and villages All these are liable to fluctuations of fortune Thus the tribes that were extant at the time of the predecessors of Panini might not be in existence at the time of Panini—and tribes might have changed their places of habitat migrating from one country to another, sometimes leaving the stamp of their names on the countries which they left for good This is evidenced by the sutra योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात् New towns, tribes, families and personalities arose and threw into background or even oblivion the older ones. This seems to have made changes in the Ganapātha from time to time imperative. But such was not the case with the Dhātupātha The Dhātus being primal elements of the language, are not liable to change. Particular froms given by a root may become obsolete, but the root itself can never become obsolete. The same old root appears under new forms This we think is the reason why the Dhātupātha has been preserved in its prestine purity and why the ganas of nouns, given by the Kās'ika and the Kaumudī sometimes differ so widely.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RIDDLE OF THE PANINIYA

I. The Dhātupātha does not seem to be by the author of the Astd., but seems to be the work of a predecessor of Panini. But nevertheless the arrangement of roots, and the system of इत्s, in the Dhātupātha clearly shows that the author of the Dhātupātha knew very many sutras now found in the Astd. and so arranged the roots in the Dhātupātha as to serve the purposes of those sutras. (Chapter II)

II Similar is the case with the Ganapātha (Chap VII)

III. The Astādhyāyī.

(1) The Mandūkapluti, the चादुदृत्पद्योत्तरस्माद्वृत्ति, and the purposeless Yogavibhāga indicate sutras that have been added later to an already existing book of sutras. (Chapter VI)

(2) *a* In the Astd there is not a single important Paribhāsā that has not important exceptions (p 57).

b Some important Paribhāsās that were expressly laid down in the works of Panini's predecessors and not met with in the Astd., are nevertheless applicable to the Astd., because they are, in the words of the Paribhāsendusekhara—पाणिनीयतन्त्रे ज्ञापकन्यायसिद्धानि I.* (p. 33)

(3) The Astd. is not uniform in its use of Sanjnās or technical terms (Chapter IV)

---

* Nagoji Bhatta begins his Paribhasendusekhara with the words प्राचीनवैयाकरणतन्त्रे वाचनिकानि, अत्र पाणिनीयतन्त्रे ज्ञापकन्यायसिद्धानि भाष्यवार्तिकयोरुपनिबद्धानि यानि परिभाषारूपाणि तानि व्याख्यायन्ते ।

(4) There are to be found in the Astd some metrical sutras (Chapter V)

(5) The Astd. is very irregular in its use of cases (Ibid)

(6) The Nipātana sūtras intervene abruptly between rules expressed in the regular analytic form (Ibid)

(7) In the Astd the Vedic literature is referred to promiscuously with the words छन्दस्, मन्त्र and निगम, and the notion of option is expressed indiscriminately with the words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम, विभाषा and बहुलम् For 'substance' four words are used द्रव्य, सत्त्व, अधिकरण and वस्तु (p 66)

If we can formulate a hypothesis which will rationally explain all the above facts connected with the Paninian system we can be sure of having arrived at the right solution of the riddle of the Paniniya

"It will be long before we understand, if indeed we ever come to do so, what and how much of it is Panini's own, in addition to the work of his grammatical predecessors"

Whitney, The Veda in Panini, p. 1.

CHAPTER IX

THE STRUCTURE OF THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ.

I

Panini and his Predecessors:— Panini was not the first grammarian of India. Many great grammarians like S'ākaṭāyana had come and gone before him Panini was not even the founder of the school which goes by his name. He refers to his 'आचार्याः' and this shows that Panini was not the founder of a new school, but that he was one of a *series of* आचार्य्स of a school that already existed in his time. And so Panini must have carried on the work that was done by the predecessors in his school and he must have carried it on mainly on the lines laid down by them. At the time of Panini there were many schools of grammar in India The names of some of the great figures belonging to schools other than the one to which Panini belonged, are preserved for us in the Astd. They are Āpis'ali, Kās'yapa, Gārgya Gālava, Cākravarmaṇa, Bhāradvāja Sākaṭāyana, Sākalya, Senaka and Sphoṭāyana. This long array of names of the predecessors of Panini, is sufficient to show that the science of grammar had made much progress before Panini—nay, the theory of Sphota, which is peculiar to grammarians seems, to judge from the name Sphoṭāyana to have been fully formulated long before Panini. In Panini's time we are told by Patanjali,*

* किं पुनराकृतिः पदार्थः, आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्? उभयमित्याह। कथं ज्ञायते?। उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि। आकृतिं पदार्थं मत्वा जात्याख्यायामेकस्मिन् बहुवचनमन्यतरस्यामित्युच्यते। द्रव्यं पदार्थं मत्वा सरूपाणामित्येकशेष आरभ्यते ॥ Paspas'ā

there were already developed two theories about ' पदार्थ ' one asserting that the आकृति was the पदार्थ, and the other the द्रव्य. And Panini could not choose between the two and accepted both.

Seeing that so much work on the science of Grammar had been already done before Panini by so many Ācāryas, the question how far Panini is indebted to them naturally arises. This question in one of its important aspects viz, as to in what relation Panini stands to his predecessors as regards his technical devices,—has been admirably dealt with by Dr. Mangala Deva Shastri, M. A. Ph. D. in a very interesting paper read by him before the Fourth Oriental Conference.

The paper is divided into three parts. In the first part the doctor has shown that the Māhes'wara sūtras and the Pratyāhāras we get from them are pre Paninian, and that even the Pratyāhāras ' सुप् ' and ' तिङ् ' are really pre Paninian. He has also pointed out that the two Paribhāṣās "गतिकारकोपपदानां कृद्भि सह समासवचनं प्राक् सुबुत्पत्ते " and "श्तिपा शपानुबन्धेन निर्दिष्टं यद्गणेन च । यत्रैकाज्ग्रहणं चैव पञ्चैतानि न यङ्लुकि ॥" are universally proclaimed by the commentators to be पूर्वाचार्यपरिभाषाs. And he has proved that the terms सम्प्रसारण, उपधा, भट्न्द, वृद्धि, प्रगृह्य, and श्लु which is the Astd. विकरण of the third conjugation, were also known before Panini

In the second part he has shown that Panini was not the first grammarian to make the use of Anubandhas, and that in many cases the meaning of the Anubandhas now found in the Astd. is identical with that which was attached to them in earlier grammatical works

In the third part, the learned doctor goes on to show that almost all *the Akrtrima Sanjnās used in the Astd.* were also to be found in pre-Paninian works, and that the device of coining artificial Sanjnās was not wholly unknown to Panini's predecessors.

II

सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्:— Keeping these facts in our mind, let us turn to the Astd. What do we find there? The Sanjnās laid down in the Astd. are not adhered to in the Astd. itself. There is no important Paribhāṣā which has not important exceptions, not a few, but many There is no uniformity in the use *of cases.* The Veda as was pointed out by Whitney, is referred to as छन्दस् मन्त्र and निगम promiscuously. And the notion of option is expressed *with* the words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम् indiscriminately.

The last of these facts had struck Patanjali also, and under S. II. ii. 57 (पूर्वापरप्रथमचरम०) & S. VI. iii. 14. (तत्पुरुषे कृति बहुलम्) he gives an explanation of it in the words :—

अवश्यं खल्वस्माभिरिदं वक्तव्यम्—बहुलमन्यतरस्यामुभयथा वैकेषामिति। सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्॥

Here at last we have found the key to more than half the riddle of the Astd. The words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा, एकेषाम्, and बहुलम् are used indiscriminately to express the notion of option, because, सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्। The Veda is promiscuously referred to as छन्दस्, मन्त्र, *and* निगम *because,* सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्। There is much irregularity in the use of cases because सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्। There is no important Paribhāṣā without important exceptions because सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्।

And again, the Sanjnās laid down in the Astd. are departed from in the Astd itself, because— सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् ।.

The word पारिषदम् is derived from the word परिषद् by adding the Taddhita affix अण्, according to S. पत्राध्वर्युपरिषदश्च IV. iii. 123, in the sense of 'तस्येदम्', which may be roughly translated into English by 'belonging to' Thus the word पारिषदम् means. belonging to a परिषद् or school.* The word सर्ववेदपारिषदं therefore means 'belonging to all the Vedic schools'. So, Patanjali says, this expressing of the notion of 'option' by the use of various words वा etc, is due to the fact that the Pāninīya S'āstra does not belong to one school but to all the schools of all the Vedas, and the use of different words expressing 'option' in the Astd, is in keeping with the use of different words expressing option in the various Vedic schools. Thus Patanjali tells us that the Astd. is made up mainly of sutras culled out from grammatical works, belonging to various schools of the Veda, and the irregularities in it are to be attributed to that fact.

We may also explain the word सर्ववेदपारिषदम् as परिषदि जातं पारिषदम्। सर्ववेदानां पारिषदं सर्ववेदपारिषदम् ।. Thus the sentence 'सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्', means: This S'āstra originated in all the schools of all the Vedas. And what is the consequence of this? तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्, it is impossible to stick to any single way in the Astd, uniformity is impossible in the Astd This means that the sutras of which the Astd. is made up originated, not in any single school of any single Veda, but in all the schools of all the Vedas, and whatever Irregularities we may come across in the Astd. are attributable to that fact.

* अध्येतृसंघः परिषद्. Kaiyata on S. VI iii. 14.

We must remember that the Vyākarana is one of the six Angas of the Veda. Like all sciences of ancient India, the Vyākarana also originated in the Vedic schools, and it is interesting to note that the ऐतरेयारण्यक teaches the संहितोपासना.

This statement of Patanjali that the Pāninīya Śāstra is सर्ववेदपारिषद, and consists mainly of sutras culled out from various sources is supported by the fact that we come across in it sutras *by at least three different philosopher grammarians* one a नैयायिक, the second a सांख्य and the third a भाववादिन्. In the Astd there are four different words used to express what is in English expressed by the word 'substance': viz. 'अधिकरण' in S. V. iii. 43., 'वस्तु' in S V. iv 9, 'सत्त्व' in S. I. iv. 57., and 'द्रव्य' in S. V iv. 11.* These four sutras in which these four different words for 'substance' occur are not evidently by one author. If Panini had written all these four sutras himself, why did he use four different words to convey a single notion, viz, that of 'substance'? Here it is evident that Panini borrowed verbatim at least three of the above sutras from earlier Ācāryas. If we suppose that Panini used the word द्रव्य for 'substance', then he must have incorporated sutras I. iv. 57, IV iii. 43. and V. iv. 9. into the Astd. from the works of three different grammarians belonging to different schools of thought. Thus S IV. iii. 43. (अधिकरण विचाले च), containing the word 'अधिकरण' meaning 'substance', was evidently borrowed from the work of a grammarian, who with the नैयायिकs, believed that the द्रव्य is different from the गुणs, that the द्रव्य is the अधिकरण of the गुणs, that the द्रव्य or substance is the place where the गुणs reside.[1] And S. V. iv. 9

* Vide foot note on p 66.

1. Cf. गौतमन्यायसूत्र. II. ii. 66 व्यक्तिगुणविशेषाश्रयो मूर्तिः I. Vatsyayana Bhasya — अरूपवान् इति व्यक्तिरिन्द्रियग्राह्येति न सर्वं द्रव्यं व्यक्तिः ।

(आन्यन्तान्उवन्युनि) was evidently borrowed from a grammarian who with the Sānkhyas believed that the द्रव्य was nothing but a 'गुणानां बन्धु', a bundle of qualities.[2]

Some philosophers, of whom Vārṣyāyaṇi was the chief went beyond the categories of the Sānkhyas and the Naiyāyikas and arrived at the conception of 'भाव'. They thought that the प्रधान and the पुरुष of Sānkhyas and the ईश्वर, the परमाणु s &c. of the Naiyāyikas, were nothing but the various manifestations of the भाव; and that the भाव was the primal substance which manifests itself as the universe.*

यो गुणविशेषाणां स्पर्शान्तानां गुरुत्वघनत्वद्रवत्वसंस्काराणामव्यापिनः परिमाणस्याश्रयो यथासम्भवं तद्द्रव्यं मूर्तिमूर्च्छितावयवत्वादिति ॥

2 वस्त्वन्यथैव प्रक्रान्तो भिन्नेषु प्रतिवस्तु। स्वमन्वयानुकारेण शब्दार्थः प्रविभज्यते ॥ Punyaraja's Commentary ......तथा च वैशेषिकेणात्र यन्निर्णयं प्रतिपादयितुं घटशब्दः प्रयुक्तः सांख्यैर्गुणसमाहारमात्रमभिमन्यते ।. Vakyapadiya. Benares 1887, p. 138.

1 & 2 किं पुनर्द्रव्यम् ? के पुनर्गुणाः ? शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धा गुणाः । ततोऽन्यद् द्रव्यम् । किं पुनरन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यमाहोस्विदनन्यत् ? गुणस्यायं भावाद् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेशं कुर्वन् ख्यापयत्यन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यमिति ॥ अनन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यम् । नह्यन्यदुपलभ्यते । पशोः खल्वपि विशसितस्य पर्णशते न्यस्तस्य नान्यच्छब्दादिभ्य उपलभ्यते ॥ अन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यम् । तत्त्वनुमानगम्यम् ।..... कोऽसावनुमानः ? ।........यस्य गुणान्तरेष्वपि प्रादुर्भवत्सु तत्त्वं न विहन्यते तद्द्रव्यम् ।... .....तद्यथा—आमलकादीनां फलानां रक्तादयः पीतादयश्च गुणाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति । आमलकं बदरमित्येव भवति ॥ Bhasya on 5 V.1. 119. तस्य भावस्त्वतलौ ।.

द्रव्ये च भवतः कः सम्प्रत्ययः ? यदि तावद् गुणसमुदायो द्रव्यम.........।. Bhasya 5 IV. i 3. स्त्रियाम्.

* इदानीं कारणात्मा भावो निरूप्यते । क्रियाद्रव्ययोः स्वात्मस्थो विशेषः कार्यात्मप्रत्यस्तमयोः पुरुषोपभोगसन्तानोपरमे कार्यात्मभावातीतो येनात्मभावेन भवनमात्राभिपन्निरन्तः प्रलयकालेऽवतिष्ठते सोऽत्यन्ताविनाशधर्मा आत्मा भाव इत्युच्यते ।

This 'भाव' was divided into two categories—'पूर्वापरीभूत' and 'मूर्तः सत्त्वभूतः'. The first is expressed in language by verbs and the second by nouns.* Thus what the nouns express is भाव that has, as it were, become frozen (मूर्त). When the भाव becomes frozen or मूर्त it is called सत्त्व. This 'सत्त्व' is analogous to 'द्रव्य', and so the word सत्त्व became synonymous with the word द्रव्य. And we think that those sutras in the Astd in which the word सत्त्व occurs in the sense of द्रव्य or substance are taken from grammarians who, with Vārsyāyaṇi, held that this world of actions and forms is nothing but a manifestation of the भाव. This doctrine of भाव was evolved in the Vedaparisats. Durga tells us that this doctrine was taught in the वेदरहस्यब्राह्मण. †

These sutras show that Panini, whenever he borrowed sutras from others' works, borrowed them verbatim, without troubling himself to change their wording; otherwise 'वस्तु', 'अधिकरण' and 'सत्त्व' in the sutras considered above would have been changed to simple 'द्रव्य', which smacks of no particular school of philosophy.

आह । कथमयमिह प्रसङ्गः । उच्यते । सद्विकारा एव हि द्रव्यगुणकर्मभावेनावस्थिताः सन्तो नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपातैरभिधीयन्ते इत्यभिप्रायः ॥...आह प्रधानमेतत्स्यात्। किं कारणम् । तद्भावेन ह्येतज्जगदवतिष्ठते प्रलयकाल इत्येके मन्यन्ते । तच नैव । किं कारणम् । भावविकार एव हि सोऽपरदर्शनसाम्यस्यात्—प्रधानमात्र इत्युच्यते। पुरुषस्तर्हि । तदप्यसमेव हेतुस्तुल्यत्वात् ॥ एतेनैवेश्वरपरमाण्वादिभावविकाराः प्रत्युक्ताः । ईश्वरभावः परमाणुभाव इति सोऽपरदर्शनात् ॥ Durga on Nirukta Adhyaya I., Pada I. Khanda 2.

* पूर्वापरीभूतं भावमाख्यातेनाचष्टे व्रजति पचतीत्युपक्रमप्रभृत्यपवर्गपर्यन्तम् । मूर्तं सत्त्वभूतं सत्त्वनामभिः । Nirukta I. I. 1.

† Vide Nirukta. Anandasrama Edition (1921) p 28. वेदरहस्यब्राह्मणेऽस्य तत्र विस्तरेणायं निर्णीयते.

The use of the word परिमाण in the Astd is worth noting In S V. i 39 (गोद्व्यचोरसंख्यापरिमाणाश्वादेर्यत्) both the words, परिमाण and संख्या occur, and it is evident that the word परिमाण does not include 'संख्या' But in S IV iii. 156 (क्रीतवत्परिमाणात्)—संख्या परिमाणग्रहणेन गृह्यते, न रूढिपरिमाणमेव। (Kās'ika). It is evident that the two sutras come from two different mathematician-grammarians, who held different views about the nature of परिमाण.

Another circumstance that shows that the Astd. is made up of sutras borrowed verbatim from various sources, and that in it नैष पन्था: शक्य आस्थातुम् — is the occurrence in the Astd. of what the भाष्य calls 'सौत्रो निर्देश:', that is, the use of word-forms which are incorrect according to the Astd. This occurrence in the Astd. of non Astd. forms has called forth very scathing remarks from भट्टकुमारिल. Says he :—

सूत्रवार्तिकभाष्येषु दृश्यते चापशब्दनम्।
अशास्त्रा कथं ह्यशान् विस्मरेयु सचेतना ॥

सूत्रे तावज्जनिकर्तु: प्रकृतिरित्यत्र द्वावपशब्दौ। जनिशब्देन हि इक्श्तिपौ धातुनिर्देशे इत्यनेन लक्षणेनान्वितो धातुरेव निर्दिश्यते। न च तस्य कर्तृ: प्रकृते अपादानसंज्ञाप्यते। जायमानस्य पुनरर्थस्य जनिशब्दो वाचकतया नैव लक्षणेनानुगत। तेनायं दरिद्र इवापशब्द: जनिमात्रवाचित्वात् तदर्थं प्रत्ययसाधुरेव विज्ञायते॥ तथा तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरीति प्रतिषिद्धषष्ठीसमासप्रयोगाद्व्याकरणफलपरित्याग:। एवं तत्प्रयोजक इति प्रतिषिद्ध एव समास ॥‡

That the later commentators have somehow or other proved or tried to prove, that the word जनिकर्तृ is a correct Astd form† does not entitle us to think that nowhere in the Astd., the rider has forgotten the horse on which he is riding.

‡ तन्त्रवार्तिक under S. 24 in अ०.I. पा iii अ० 8 मीमांसादर्शन. Vol I. p. 258 Anandasrama Edition.

† Vide Tattvabodhini on I 4. 30. जनिकर्तु: प्रकृति:

In many sutras word-forms occur which can in no way be *shown to be supported by the Astd, and which the best of* commentators are compelled to pass over as quickly as possible, *making the short remark* सौत्रो निर्देशः,

तिर्यच्यपवर्गे । III iv. 60.

भाष्यम्:— अयुक्तोऽयं निर्देशः । तिरश्चीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रो निर्देशः ॥

अन्वच्यानुलोम्ये । III. iv. 64.

भाष्यम् :— अयुक्तोऽयं निर्देशः । अन्वचीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रोऽयं निर्देशः॥

छदिरुपधिबलेर्ढञ् V. i. 13. समाहारद्वन्द्वे सौत्रं पुंस्त्वम् ।

Bālamanoramā & Tattvabodh.

तदर्थं विकृतेः प्रकृतौ । V. i. 12. "तदर्थमिति सामान्ये नपुंसकं व्यत्ययेन सप्तमीस्थाने प्रथमा ।. Tattvabodhini.

अनेन तदर्थमित्यत्र सुब्व्यत्ययेन सप्तम्याःस्थाने प्रथमा, लिङ्गव्यत्ययेन च स्त्रीलिंगस्य स्थाने नपुंसकलिंगं कृतमिति दर्शयति । ननु च छन्दसि व्यत्यय उक्त । नेदं छन्द । तत्कृतो व्यत्यय. । छन्दोवत्सूत्राणि भवन्तीत्यदोषः ।

Nyāsa.

युवोरनाकौ । VII i 1.

समाहारद्वन्द्वे युवुन इति प्राप्नोति । इतरेतरयोगे तु युवोरिति । तत्र सौत्रत्वा- न्निर्देशस्य नुमभावस्योकारलोपं वा कृत्वा निर्देश इति न दोषः । Kaiyata.

नलोपः प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य । VIII. 2. 7.

प्रातिपदिकग्रहणमसमर्थमेव सुपां सुलुगिति षष्ठ्या लुको (*sic*) निर्दिष्टम्। पदस्येति वर्तते । प्रातिपदिकस्य पदस्य योन्त्य :... ....। *Kāśikā.*

This difficulty about the विशेषणविशेष्यभाव between 'पदस्य' and '*प्रातिपदिक' shows that the sutra was not originally under* the 'पदस्य' domain or अधिकार; and that it was put under it from somewhere else. प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य is an adjective to the word 'न' in 'नलोपः'. Therefore नलोपः is an असमर्थसमास, सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवति ।. Therefore 'नलोप.' is a compound not allowed by the अष्टाध्यायी (*Cf.* S. समर्थः पदविधिः II. i. 1.). Bhattoji tries to

get over this difficulty by imagining that नलोपः is not a compound word, but that 'न' and 'लोप.' are two distinct पदs, 'न' being equal to नस्य, with the genetive termination elided. In either case we do not get over the difficulty of non-Astādhyāyī forms, if नलोपः is a compound, there is the असमर्थसमास which is not allowed (cf Tattvabodhini: पूर्वपदेनापेक्षत्वेन समासासम्भवात्), if न=नस्य, then also we can explain it only by saying नेति लुप्तषष्ठीकं पदं सौत्रत्वात् (Tattva), which is also not quite satisfactory.

The difficulty about the असमर्थसमास is felt also in S लिङ्. सलोपोऽनन्त्यस्य Cf Tattwa सेति लुप्तषष्ठीकमनन्त्यस्येत्यनेन विशेष्यते ।

Another circumstance that proves irrefutably that whenever Panini borrowed sutras from another system, he borrowed them verbatim, without making the slightest change, is the occurrence in the अष्टाध्यायी of sutras which teach the formation of words with affixes which have इत्s which are quite useless in the अष्टाध्यायी system. For instance let us take the sutra लोहितादिडाज्भ्यः क्यष् III 1. 13 Patanjali in his Bhāṣya on this sutra has shown that both the इत्s in the affix क्यष् viz, क् and ष्, are useless and serve absolutely no purpose*. Here it is evident that S लोहिता० was borrowed from a system where both क् & ष् in the affix क्यष् had some meaning. Nay, this is not all There occur some sutras in the अष्टाध्यायी in which the affixes have इत्s which go against the system of the Astd. इत्s in their operation. The three well known sutras औङ आपः (VII. 1. 18) आङि चापः (VII. III 105) and आङो नाऽस्त्रियाम् (VII. 3. 120) are an instance in point. Let us consider the first of these three sutras —

*Cf. Kaiyata:— यदीति । अनेन ककारः प्रत्याख्यात । इदानीं षकारप्रत्याख्यानाय विचार क्रियते ।

औङ आपः । VII । 18

काशिकाः— आबन्तादङ्गादुत्तरस्यौङः शीत्ययमादेशो भवति, खट्वे पश्य । बहुराजे । कारीषगन्ध्ये ।

"औङ्, coming after a stem ending in आप् is changed to शी". Thus we get खट्वा+औ=खट्वे. Now let us turn to the Bhāṣya on the sutra.

किमर्थो ङकारः ? सामान्यग्रहणार्थः । औ इत्युच्यमाने प्रथमाद्विवचनस्यैव स्यात् । अथाप्यौङित्युच्यते । एवमपि द्वितीयाद्विवचनस्यैव स्यात् । अस्ति प्रयोजनमेतत् । किं तर्हीति । ङित्कार्यं तु प्राप्नोति । खट्वे माले । याडाप इति याट् प्राप्नोति । नैष दोषः नैवं विज्ञायते ङकार इत्संज्ञकः सोऽयं ङित् ङितीति । कथं तर्हि ? ङकार एव ङित् ङितीति । एवं तर्हि वर्णग्रहणमिदं भवति । वर्णग्रहणेषु चैतद् भवति यस्मिन्विधिस्तदादावल्ग्रहण इति न दोषो भवति ॥ अथवा वर्णग्रहणमिदं भवति । न चैतद्वर्णग्रहणेषु भवति 'अननुबन्धकग्रहणे न सानुबन्धकस्येति' ॥ <u>अथवा पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशोऽयम्</u> । पूर्वसूत्रेषु येऽनुबन्धा न तैरिहेत्कार्याणि क्रियन्ते ॥

औकारोऽयं शीविधौ ङिद्गृहीतो ङित्वाऽस्माकं नास्ति कार्ये प्रकारः ।
सामान्यार्थस्तस्य चासञ्जनेऽस्मिन् ङित्कार्यं ते स्यात् प्रसक्तं स दोषः ॥ १ ॥
ङित्त्वे विद्याद्वर्णनिर्देशमात्रं वर्णे यत्स्यात्तच्च विद्यात्तदादौ ।
वर्णश्चायं तेन ङित्त्वे न दोषो निर्देशोऽयं पूर्वसूत्रेण वा स्यात् ॥ २ ॥

It will be seen that Patanjali gives here three explantions of the strange ङ्; in the first explanation, he takes the position that the sutra is by Panini himself and that औङ् is used in the sutra as a प्रत्यय; and proceeds to explain away the याट् difficulty by taking the compound ङित् in S. घेर्ङिति as a तत्पुरुष and not as a बहुव्रीहि. This explanation not satisfying* him, he hazards a second, and says that औङ् in the sutra is not used as a प्रत्यय, but as a letter pure and simple † This explanation also was felt by him to be not

* सर्वस्याप्यविशिष्टानां द्वयमेव प्रयोजनम् ।
पूर्वशास्त्रविरोधो वा विस्पष्टार्थमिति वा ॥

Kumarila.

† Contravenes the q. 110.
प्रत्ययाप्रत्ययोः प्रत्ययस्य ग्रहणम् ।

satisfactory, and so he offers a third and, it is submitted, the correct explanation viz, that the sutra has been borrowed verbatim from earlier works. That this third explanation is the correct one and that Panini did borrow from others sutras verbatim, can be seen by comparing S आङि चापः (VII 3 105) and आङो नाऽस्त्रियाम् (VII 3 120) with the present sutra. The first of these has not at all been commented upon by Patanjali and though he has commented upon the second one, he has unfortunately not considered whence this आङ्, strange to the Paninian system comes. The Siddhānta Kaumudī on "आङो नाऽस्त्रियाम्" definitely says 'आङिति टासंज्ञा प्राचाम्,' and the Kāśikā commenting upon S VII. iii 105 (आङि चापः) says "आङिति पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशेन तृतीयैकवचनं गृह्यते"

If it was anywhere imperatively necessary for Panini to translate sutras borrowed from the works of grammarians of other schools, it was in these three instances. He has not done so Does this circumstance not entitle us to conclude that Panini, whenever he borrowed sutras from others borrowed them verbatim without troubling himself to make changes in them so as to conform with his own system?

Bhāradvāja is one of the grammarians named by Panini in the अष्टाध्यायी To some sutras now found in the अष्टाध्यायी भारद्वाजीय Vārtikas are attached and are quoted by Patanjali Is it that such sutras are borrowed by Panini from Bhāradvāja ?

Thus we see that the Astd. contains sutras borrowed verbatim from various sources and incorporated into it. It is सर्ववेदपारिषदम्, and therefore, तत्र नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम्.

Now let us turn to the problems of the Pāṇinīya (Chapter VIII) and see whether we can solve any of them.

III (7) The Veda is promiscuously referred to as छन्दस्, मन्त्र, and निगम, in the Astd , and the notion of option is expressed by as many as five words— वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम्.

Solution :— सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्था: शक्य आस्थातुम् I. This S'āstra originated and exists, not in one particular school of one particular Veda, but in all the schools of all the Vedas. This S'āstra contains sutras, borrowed verbatim from various sources and incorporated into it. Therefore there is bound to be variety in the use of words नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम् I.

(6) The निपातनसूत्रs intervene abruptly in the middle of sutras expressed in the regular analytic form

Solution — सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् I.

(5) There is much irregularity in the use of cases in the Astd.

Solution — सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् I तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्. The Astd. is built up of sutras drawn from various sources; and the irregularity, or rather the variety, in the use of cases is due to that fact तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्.

(4) There occur in the Astd. some sutras which, taken singly or together with a preceding or following sutra, fall into metre.

Solution — सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् I तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् I. The metrical sutras were probably borrowed and incorporated into the Astd.. from metrical grammatical works like the Ṛkprātis'ākhya.

(3) The Astd. is not uniform in its use of technical terms or Saṃjñās.

Solution - सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम्। न शक्यमेका समामास्थातुम्। It is impossible to stick to any particular term to express any particular idea or thing, because the Astd sutras come from various sources.

(2 *b*) Many Paribhāṣās 'प्राचीनवैयाकरणतन्त्रे वाचनिका', though not expressly laid down in the Astd., are nevertheless applicable to it because they are in the words of Nagojibhatta पाणिनीयतन्त्रे ज्ञापकन्यायसिद्धा

Solution — सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। Portions from the works of प्राचीनवैयाकरण have gone towards the making up of the Astd. and therefore the paribhāṣās which were 'वाचनिका' in their तन्त्र, are also applicable generally speaking to the Astd.

(2 *a*) All the important paribhāṣās found in the Astd have numerous important exceptions in the Astd. itself.

Solution — सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम्। The Astd. contains sutras from various earlier grammatical works These earlier grammatical works had their own paribhāṣās, which sometimes differed from the paribhāṣās to be met with in the Astd The sutras of the earlier grammatical works naturally accorded to the paribhāṣās which were to be found in those earlier grammatical works and when some of the sutras of the earlier grammatical works were taken verbatim into the Astd, naturally they formed exceptions to the Astd paribhāṣās

But the matter does not end here We seem to have arrived at an earlier grammatical work forming the basis of the Astd For evidently the fact that there are some paribhāṣās found in the Astd entitles us to expect that a book of sutras which was written strictly according to the paribhāṣās now to be met with in the Astd, lies hidden in the Astd

And this is supported by the fact that the *Mandūkapluti* the चातुरर्थ्योत्तरत्रानुवर्तनं, and the purposeless *Yogavibhaga* seem to indicate sutras added later to an already existing book of sutras

III

THE BASIS OF THE ASTD.

Now let us take the following six sutras and consider them carefully. *A thorough understanding of their significance* will throw much light on how Panini worked on the construction of the Astd

जनपदे लुप् ॥ IV. ॥ 81

Kasika — देशे तन्नाम्नीति यश्चातुरर्थिक प्रत्ययो भवति, तस्य देशविशेष जनपदेऽभिधेये लुब्भवति । ग्रामसमुदायो जनपद । पञ्चालानां निवासो जनपद पञ्चाला । कुरव । मत्स्या । अङ्गा । वङ्गा । मगधा । सुह्मा । पुण्ड्रा ।

वरणादिभ्यश्च॥ IV ॥ 82

Kasika — वरण इत्येवमादिभ्य उत्पन्नस्य चातुरर्थिकस्य प्रत्ययस्य लुब्भवति । अजनपदार्थ आरम्भ । वरणानामदूरभव नगर वरणा । etc

लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने । I ॥ 51

Panini proceeds to refute this last sutra (I ii 51) which is that of his पूर्वाचार्य †

तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् ॥ I ii 53

Kasika — तदिति प्रकृतं युक्तवद्भावलक्षणं निर्दिश्यते। तद् अशिष्यं न वक्तव्यम्। कस्मात्? संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्। संज्ञाशब्दा हि नानालिङ्गसंख्याः प्रमाणं पञ्चालाः वरणाः इति। नैते योगशब्दाः। किं तर्हि? जनपदादीनां संज्ञा एताः। तत्र लिङ्गं वचनं च स्वभावसिद्धमेव न यत्नप्रतिपाद्यम्। यथा आपो दाराः गृहाः सिकताः इति ॥

Panini having thus refuted S I ii 51 which is a sutra of his predecessors, proceeds now to refute the sutras that enjoin लुप् elision like S जनपदे लुप्, on which S I. ii. 51 (लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने) depends * and which also must therefore be पूर्वाचार्यसूत्रs —

लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात्। I. ii 54.

Kasika —लुबप्यशिष्यः। योऽयं जनपदे लुप्, वरणादिभ्यश्चेति लुबुच्यते अयं न वक्तव्यः। किं कारणं योगाप्रख्यानात्। नहि पञ्चालाः वरणाः इति योगसम्बन्धः प्रख्यायते। नैतदुपलभामहे क्षत्रियोगान्नगरे वरणा इति। किं तर्हि संज्ञा एताः। तस्मादत्र तन्निवासादिलक्षणस्तद्धितो नैवोत्पद्यते। किं लुपा विधानेन।

योगप्रमाणे च तदभावे अदर्शनं स्यात्। I ii. 55

Kasika —पञ्चालादयः संज्ञाशब्दा न योगनिमित्ता इत्युक्तम्। तथावश्यमेवाभ्युपगन्तव्यम्। योगप्रमाणे हि तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात्। यदि पञ्चालादिशब्दो योगस्य प्रमाणं योगस्य वाचकः स्यात् ततस्तदभावेऽदर्शनमप्रयोगः स्यात्। दृश्यते च सम्प्रति विनैव क्षत्रियसम्बन्धेन जनपदेषु पञ्चालादिशब्दः। ततोऽवसीयते नायं योगनिमित्तः। किं तर्हि रूढिरूपेणैव तत्र प्रवृत्त इति ॥

The Kas'ika tells us that I ii. 51. is a पूर्वाचार्यसूत्र borrowed by Panini And the tenor of the Kas'ika on I. ii. 53, 54 and 55, clearly shows that sutras जनपदे लुप् and वरणादिभ्यश्च are

---

† तदशिष्यं पूर्वाचार्यसूत्रं पाणिनिः प्रत्याचष्टे।

Balamanorama on I ii. 53

* *Cf.* उपर्यपि च प्रत्याख्यास्यतेऽपि प्रत्याचष्टे—लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात् ॥ Tattvab.

And this is supported by the fact that the Mandūkaplutı the चातुरर्थ्यस्योत्तरत्रानुवर्तन, and the purposeless Yogavıbhaga seem to ind cate sutras added later to an already existing book of sutras

III

THE BASIS OF THE ASTD

Now let us take the following s x sutras and consider them carefully. A thorough understanding of their signifi cance will throw much light on how Panını worked on the construction of the Astd

जनपदे लुप् ॥ IV. ॥ 81

Kasıka — देश तदस्मिन्निति यश्चातुरर्थिक प्रत्ययो भवति, तस्य देशविशेषे जनपदेऽभिधेये लुब्भवति । ग्रामसमुदाया जनपद । पञ्चालाना निवासो जनपद पञ्चाला । कुरव । मत्स्या । अङ्गा । वङ्गा । मगधा । सुह्मा । पुण्ड्रा ।

वरणादिभ्यश्च॥ IV ॥ 82

Kasıka — वरण इत्येवमादिभ्य उत्पन्नस्य चातुरर्थिकस्य प्रत्ययस्य लुब्भवति । अजनपदार्थ आरम्भ । वरणानामदूरभव नगर वरणा । etc

लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने । I ॥ 51

Kasıka — लुपीति लुप्संज्ञया लुप्तस्य प्रत्ययस्यार्थ उच्यत ॥ तत्र लुपि युक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने भवत । युक्तवदिति निष्ठाप्रत्ययेन क्तवतुना प्रकृत्यर्थ उच्यत । स हि प्रत्ययार्थमात्मना युनक्ति । तस्य युक्तवतो व्यक्तिवचन लुबर्थे विधीयत । अथवा युक्त प्रकृत्यर्थ प्रत्ययार्थेन सम्बद्ध । तस्मिन्निव व्यक्तिवचने लुबर्थे भवत । व्यक्तिवचन इति च लिंगसंख्ययो पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देश । तदायमेवेद सूत्रम् । तथा चास्य प्रत्याख्यान भविष्यति । तदशिष्य संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वादिति । व्यक्ति स्त्रीपुनपुंसकानि । वचनमेकत्वद्वित्वबहुत्वानि । पञ्चाला क्षत्रिया पुल्लिंगा । बहुवचनविषया । तेषा निवासो जनपद । यथा तेषु क्षत्रियेषु व्यक्तिवचन तद्वज्जनपद भवत । पञ्चाला, कुरव । लुपीति किं ? लुकि मा भूत् ।* लवण सूप । लवणा यवागू । लवण शाकम् ॥

* Note the difference between लुप् and लुक्

Panini proceeds to refute this last sutra (I ii 51) which is that of his पूर्वाचार्य †

तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् ॥ I ii 53

Kasika — तदिति प्रकृतं युक्तवद्भावलक्षणं निर्दिश्यते । तद् अशिष्यं न वक्तव्यम् । कस्मात् ? संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् । संज्ञाशब्दा हि नानालिङ्गसंख्या प्रमाणं पञ्चाला वरणा इति । नैते योगशब्दाः । किं तर्हि ? जनपदादीनां संज्ञा एताः । तत्र लिङ्गं वचनं च स्वभावसिद्धमेव न यत्नप्रतिपाद्यम् । यथा आपः दाराः गृहाः सिकताः इति ॥

Panini having thus refuted S I ii 51 which is a sutra of his predecessors proceeds now to refute the sutras that enjoin लुप् elision like S जनपदे लुप् on which S I ii 51 (लुपि युक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने) depends * and which also must therefore be पूर्वाचार्य सूत्र —

लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात् । I ii 54

Kasika — लुबप्यशिष्यः । यो यं जनपदे लुप्, वरणादिभ्यश्चेति लुबुच्यते अयं न वक्तव्यः । किं कारणं योगाप्रख्यानात् । नहि पञ्चाला वरणा इति योगः सम्बन्धः प्रख्यायते । नैतद्गम्यते अमुष्य योगादमी वरणा इति । किं तर्हि संज्ञा एताः । तस्मादत्र तन्निवासादिषु तद्धितो नैवोत्पद्यते । किं लुपा विधानेन ।

योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात् । I ii 55

Kasika — पञ्चालादयः संज्ञाशब्दा न योगनिमित्ता इत्युक्तम् । तथावश्यं संज्ञात्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । योगप्रमाणे हि तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात् । यदि पञ्चालादिशब्दा योगस्य प्रमाणं योगस्य वाचकाः स्यात् तत्स्तदभावेऽदर्शनमप्रयोगः स्यात् । दृश्यते च सम्प्रति विनैव क्षत्रियसम्बन्धेन जनपदेषु पञ्चालादिशब्दः । ततोऽवसीयते नायं योगनिमित्तकः । किं तर्हि रूढिरूपेणैव तत्र प्रवृत्त इति ॥

The Kas'ika tells us that I ii 51 is a पूर्वाचार्यसूत्र borrowed by Panini And the tenor of the Kas'ika on I ii 53, 54 and 55, clearly shows that sutras जनपदे लुप् and वरणादिभ्यश्च are

† तदनेन पूर्वाचार्यसूत्रं पाणिनिः प्रत्याचष्टे ।

Balamanorama on I ii 53

* Cf उपजीव्य प्रत्याख्यानात् तदुपजीव्यस्य प्रत्याख्यानम्—लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात् ॥ Tattvab.

also sutras by Panini's पूर्वाचार्यः. This is also the opinion of the Bālamanoramā But the author of the तत्त्वबोधिनी says that S लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने is written by Panini himself 'पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन'.* But this is, we submit, erroneous. The Kās'ikā expressly tells us that S. लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने is a पूर्वाचार्यसूत्र, and in the face of this we cannot give credit to the opinion of the तत्त्वबोधिनी that the sutra is पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन कृतम्. The Kās'ikā is undoubtedly a far greater authority than the तत्त्वबोधिनी. Moreover, we have seen above that Panini has incorporated into his work the sutras औङ आप,' 'आङो नास्त्रियाम्' and 'आङि चाप' from the works of earlier आचार्यs without troubling himself to transform them according to his own terminology, and if it was anywhere absolutly necessary for Panini to recast his sutras borrowed from others, it was here If Panini has not cared to recast sutras which he borrowed with assent, it is extremely unlikely that he should restate in his own language the sutras of पूर्वाचार्यs which he proposes to refute, *when refuting another's opinion it is necessary for one to state* that other's opinion in that other's own words.

Let us dwell a little longer on the explanation given by the author of the Tattwabodhini He introduces the sutra 'तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्' with the note पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन कृतं सूत्रं सम्प्रति प्रत्याचष्ट And next he introduces the sutra लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात् with the words 'उपजीवकं प्रत्याख्यायोपजीव्यं प्रत्याचष्टे'. Here the sutra 'लुपियुक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने' is the उपजीव्य and the sutra 'जनपदे लुप्' the उपजीवक So if the उपजीवक sutra is composed by Panini पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन, then the उपजीव्य also must have been compo ed by him पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन Now, it is to be noted that S. लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात् is I. ii. 54 and जनपदे लुप्, IV. ii. 81 Thus the तत्त्वबोधिनी would have us believe either, that Panini

* पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन कृतं सूत्रं सम्प्रति प्रत्याचष्टे

wrote IV. ii. 81 first, and then proceeded to refute it by I. ii. 54, which is ridiculous or that Panini having told us that लुप् is अशिष्य or not to be taught in the first अध्याय proceeds himself to teach it (लुप्) by the sutra जनपदे लुप् in the fourth अध्याय which also is obviously impossible. The explanation given by the काशिका and the बालमनोरमा does not give rise to such absurdities. What actually happened was that Panini found the sutras 'लुपि युक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने' and 'जनपदे लुप्' in their respective places, i.e. one in a former and the other in a subsequent chapter of a book that already existed in his time and took that book as the basis of his work and turned it into the present अष्टाध्यायी, by revising and enlarging it with sutras mostly borrowed from other sources. This book which served Panini as the basis of his work, we submit was the work of his own "आचार्य" to whom he refers in his अष्टाध्यायी

It is to be noted that the sutras 'जनपदे लुप्' and 'लुब्योगा प्रख्यानात्' show that between two sutras of the अष्टाध्यायी, there might be in some cases an interval of several centuries. The sutra 'जनपदे लुप्' must evidently have been written at a time when the connexion between the countries and the warrior tribes from whom they (countries) got their names was living, but at the time of Panini, who wrote S. लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात्, evidently the connexion between the warrior tribes and the countries named after them was severed (*cf.* दृश्यते च सम्प्रति विनैव क्षत्रियसम्बन्धेन जनपदेषु पंचालादिशब्द. Kās'ikā). For such vast changes in the residences of the क्षत्रिय tribes to take place it must evidently have taken several centuries.

We have seen that 'वरणादिभ्यश्च' is a पूर्वाचार्यसूत्र Then evidently the वरणादिगण also is not by Panini but by the author of the sutra वरणादिभ्यश्च. Thus Panini in this case is

indebted for both the गण and the sutra pertaining to it to his "पूर्वाचार्यैः".

The छुप् ought not to be taught, says Panini Therefore, it follows, all of the sutras teaching 'छुप्' are not by Panini.

We are now in a position to formulate a hypothesis, which will rationally explain all the problems of the *Pāṇinīya*.

Panini got handed down to him as Upades'a from his Acaryas a book of sutras which conformed to the Pari bhasas now found in the Astd., with the Dhatupatha and the Ganapatha as companion volumes to that book of sutras. The book of sutras, Panini found, was *incomplete and* inadequate as a manual of Sanskrit Grammar. So he proceeded to enlarge it

1. *mainly by incorporating into it sutras borrowed* from grammatical works belonging to schools of grammar other than his own, which sutras can *be* detected by the fact that they generally contravene the Paribhasas found in the Astd., and
2. *by framing, wherever necessary, fresh* sutras of his own and adding them to it (i.e. the original book of sutras got from his Acaryas); which *sutras are* detectable by the fact that, though they conform to the Paribhasas found in the Astd., yet are indicated to be later additions by the three tests of the Mandukapluti, the चानुकृष्टस्योत्तरत्रानुवृत्ति, and the purposeless Yogavibhaga.

In this way did Panini give us a सर्ववेदपारिषदं शास्त्रम्, in which नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्.

If we take out all the sutras added by Panini, whether of his own authorship or borrowed from works of schools other

than his own we shall arrive approximatly at the original book of sutras which was got by Panini from his Ācāryas, and which formed the basis of his Aṣṭādhyāyī This we shall call The Basic Book of Sutras.

Let us turn to Chapter VIII There we read — The Dhātupātha does not seem to be by the author of the Astd but seems to be the work of a predecessor of his But nevertheless the system of इत्s and the arrangement of roots in the Dhatupātha clearly shows that the author of the Dhātupātha knew very many sutras now found in the Astd. and so arranged the roots in the Db. P as to serve the purposes of those sutras.

Solution — All such sutras which seem to have guided the author of the Dhātupātha in his composition of the Dhātupātha were contained in the Basic Book of Sutras. We think that the author of the Basic Book of Sutras is the same as the author of the Dhātupatha This Ācārya who wrote the Basic Book of Sutras seems to have held, with S'akaṭāyana and the Nairuktas that the नामानि were आख्यातजानि, and so wrote his Dhātupātha as to serve a double purpose—that of the student of grammar and also that of the student of words on the lines laid down in the Nirukta (vide p. 10).

Similar is the case with the Ganapatha The whole of the Ganapātha is the work of Panini's Ācaryas and the sutras for which the various Ganas were written are also the work of Panini's Ācāryas The sutras were a part of the Basic Book of Sutras.

This Basic Book of Sutras seems to have been mainly divided into two parts one dealing with the roots with the Dh P. attached to it, the other dealing with nouns with the

Ganapātha attached to it This is supported by the fact that, as shown by Dr. Mangala Deva Shastri, the pratyayas तिप्, शप् and श्लु, and the pratyāhara तिङ्, are pre Paninian. Evidently, the pratyaya तिप् and the pratyāhara तिङ् presuppose what is now P III iv 78 (तिप्तस्°). Thus S. III iv 78 (तिप्तस्°) must be pre Paninian. We think that S. II iv. 78 formed part of the Basic Book of Sutras on which the Astd. is built

We think that the part dealing with roots and the Dh P in the Basic Book of Sutras began with the sutra भूवादयो धातवः, which is now P. I iii 1 The sutra tells us what the words contained in the Dh. P are, it says they are roots or Dhātus. So it is *the* sutra to stand at the beginning of that part of the Basic Book of Sutras, which treated of the roots.

Strangely enough this is supported by the anomalous व् in S भूवादयो धातवः.* The one explanation given by the Vārtikakāra unhesitatingly of this 'व्' is that it is there as an invocation for auspiciousness or Mangala भूवादीनां वकारोयं मङ्गलार्थः प्रयुज्यते But in S. I. i 1. the author of the Astd. has already had his मङ्गल, by writing 'वृद्धिरादैच्' instead of 'आदैज्वृद्धि'. Now, why is there another मङ्गल in I iii. 1? Patanjali says (I iii 1) मङ्गलादीनि मङ्गलमध्यानि मङ्गलान्तानि च शास्त्राणि प्रथन्ते। But it is to be noted the मध्यमङ्गल is very rarely, if at all, found. And Patanjali himself speaks under S. I i. 1. of only the आदिमङ्गल and not at all of the मध्यमङ्गल † Even if we accept *Patanjali's dictum under S I. iii. 1 that there ought to be a* मङ्गल in the मध्य or middle of a work, evidently I iii 1. is in no sense the मध्य or the middle of the Astd It is rather its

* *Cf* Bhasya — *कुतोऽयं वकारः ? यदितास्त्यहितया निर्देशः क्रियेत* भ्वादय इति भवितव्यम्। अथासंहितया भू आदय इति भवितव्यम् ॥ I iii. 1.

† मङ्गलादीनि हि शास्त्राणि प्रथन्ते etc Bhasya on S I i 1

the Astd dealing with the declension of nouns and the Taddhita affixes is really the work of Panini's Ācāryas and formed part of the Basic Book of Sutras

Here we seem to have arrived at rather a very startling conclusion. The Dhātupātha is not by Panini but by his Ācāryas. The same is the case with the Ganapātha. And in the Astd itself only those sutras can be definitely ascribed to Panini which, though they do not go against the Paribhāsas found in the Astd yet can be shown to be additions by Panini by the three tests of the Mandūkapluti, the चाद्ररूपोत्तरचानुवृत्ति, and the purposeless Yogavibhāga. Such sutras form only a negligible minority in the Astd Then why call the Astd. system of grammar the Pāninīya at all? W h y? Because—answer Patanjali and Vāmana and Jayāditya—it is पाणिनिना प्रोक्तम्। न तु कृतम्।.

भाष्यम् —पाणिनिना प्रोक्तं पाणिनीयम्। Paspas'ā

तेन प्रोक्तम्॥ IV. iii 101

वार्तिकम् —प्रोक्तग्रहणमनर्थकं तत्रादर्शनात्॥

भाष्यम् —प्रोक्तग्रहणमनर्थकम्। किं कारणम्। तत्रादर्शनात्। ग्रामे ग्रामे कालापकं काठकं च प्रोच्यते तत्रादर्शनात्। न च तत्र प्रत्ययो दृश्यते॥

वार्तिकम् —ग्रन्थे च दर्शनात्॥

भाष्यम् —यत्र च दृश्यते ग्रन्थः स भवति। तत्र कृते ग्रन्थ इत्येव सिद्धम्॥ छन्दोर्थं तर्हीदं वक्तव्यम्। न हि छन्दांसि क्रियन्ते। नित्यानि छन्दांसि॥

वार्तिकम् —छन्दोर्थमिति चेत्तुल्यम्।

भाष्यम् —छन्दोर्थमिति चेत्तुल्यमेतद्भवति। ग्रामे ग्रामे काठकं कालापकं च प्रोच्यते। तत्रादर्शनात्। न च तत्र प्रत्ययो दृश्यते। ग्रन्थे दर्शनात्। यत्र दृश्यते ग्रन्थः स भवति। तत्र कृते ग्रन्थ इत्येव सिद्धम्॥ ननु चोक्तम्। न हि छन्दांसि क्रियन्ते। नित्यानि छन्दांसीति। यद्यप्यर्थो नित्यः। यात्वसौ वर्णानुपूर्वी सानित्या। तद्भेदाच्चैतद्भवति। काठकम्। कालापकम्। मौदकम्। पैप्पलादक-

मिति ॥ न तर्हीदानीमिदं वक्तव्यम् । वक्तव्यं च । किं प्रयोजनम्? । यत्तेन प्रोक्तं न च तेन कृतम् । माथुरी वृत्तिः ॥ यदि तर्हि अस्य निबन्धनमस्ति । इदमेव वक्तव्यम् । तत्र वक्तव्यम् । तदप्यवश्यं वक्तव्यम् । यत्तेन कृतं न च तेन प्रोक्तम् । वाररुचं काव्यम् । जाल्कवाः श्लोकाः ॥

तेन प्रोक्तम् ॥ IV. iii. 10

Kasika:—तेनेति तृतीयासमर्थात् प्रोक्तमित्येतस्मिन्नर्थे यथाविहितं प्रत्ययो भवति । प्रकर्षेणोक्तं प्रोक्तमित्युच्यते, न तु कृतम् । कृते ग्रन्थ इत्यनेन गतत्वात् । अन्येन कृता माथुरेण प्रोक्ता माथुरी वृत्तिः । पाणिनीयम् । आपिशलम् । काशकृत्स्नम् ॥

And it is because the vast majority of sutras in the Astd. are not by himself but by his predecessors, that Panini refers to the Sūtrapātha as उपदेश.

उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत् ॥ I. iii 2.

Kasika—उपदिश्यतेऽनेनेत्युपदेशः शास्त्रवाक्यानि सूत्रपाठः खिलपाठश्च ॥

so quickened the scientific study of the Astd † Moreover, a plagiarist discovers a book written by an ancient author, which is lost to the world, and palms it off as his own work. The Astādhyāyī was in no sense lost to the world in Candra's time It was studied all over India. Then, why did Candra take the Astd. and recast some sutras in it and make some slight innovations in its arrangement and offer it to the world as the Cāndra Vyākarana ? Why did no Candra write an entirely new work ? Candra saw that the Astd. sutras were studied from hoary antiquity. Generations after generations of students had committed them to memory and philosophers and litterateurs had conducted their grammatico philosophical discussions on the basis of the Astd. sutras Commentators had quoted them in their commentaries. And now, if Candra had written sutras altogether new, the students of Candra would have been unable to understand grammatical discussions based on the Astd sutras, and to that extent would have been cut off from the main philosophical and literary currents. So what Candra did was to take bodily sutras from Panini, making only a few necessary changes, so that a student of Candra can easily understand, generally speaking, all grammatical references to and discussions based upon the Astd. sutras, Similar, it seems were the considerations that weighed with Panini He wanted to give us a manual of grammar which would be exhaustive and comprehensive. He found that his own Ācāryas had handed down to him a

† य पतञ्जलिशिष्येभ्यो भ्रष्टो व्याकरणागमः ।
काले स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थित· ॥ 488 ॥
पर्वतादागमं लब्ध्वा भाष्यबीजानुसारिभि· ।
स नीतो बहुशाखत्वं चन्द्राचार्यादिभि· पुनः ॥ 489 ॥
Vakyapadiya Kanda II

system of grammar, however incomplete and defective. He also found works as those of Āpis'ali having great authority and currency among the people.* Under these circumstances if Panini had given his generation an entirely new work, his generation would not have accepted him. Therefore Panini took the system of grammar that was handed down to him from his Ācāryas for the basis of his work and developed it into the present Pāninīya.

Fortunately for us the Vārttikas which are attached to the sutras of the Astd and which are attributed to Kātyāyana, are an illustration in point. Nagoji is clearly of opinion that the Varttikas are not all of them by one author. *Cf.* Uddyota न च वचनेत्यस्यापि वार्तिकत्वाद्वार्तिककृतां र्यादवचस कथं प्रमाणत्वेनाश्रयणमिति भाष्ये वार्तिकत्वाद्यनुपपन्नमिति वाच्यम् । अन्योऽपि वार्तिककारो वार्तिककारान्तरोक्तवचनं प्रमाणान्तरत्वेनाश्रयतीत्यदोषात् ।† And Kielhorn has shown that the Vartikas now attributed to Kātyāyana are not all of them his work, there were more than one Vārtikakāras. Thus says Kielhorn the prose Vārtikas are by an author different from that of the S'lokavārtikas because some S'loka vartikas are directed against prose Vārtikas, others try to improve upon them, and yet others intend to explain them. Kātyāyana was thus the last great Vārtikakāra who collected together all the Vârtikas by his predecessors with some additions of his own. Similar was the case with Panini. He was

* तत्र ये साधवस्ते शास्त्रेणानुशिष्यन्ते । असाधुभ्यो विविच्य प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागेन ज्ञाप्यन्ते । इमे साधव इति । कथं पुनरिदमाचार्येण पाणिनिनावगतमेते साधव इति ? । आपिशलेन पूर्वव्याकरणेन । आपिशलिना तर्हि केनावगमः ? तत पूर्वेण व्याकरणेन ।

Padamanjari

† On Bhasya on Varttika छन्दस्यपाते च, on S समर्थः पदविधिः, II 1 1

the last great Sūtrakāra of the school to which he belonged and he built up his Astādhyāyī mainly out of sutras from his predecessors. Thus Panini did not wipe out of existence the works of his predecessors by his Astd, but preserved them in it

Panini's work —Now, it may be asked, was Panini simply a Pravaktṛ? and if he was a mere Pravaktṛ how is it that his name has ecclipsed all other names in the field of grammar? He has ecclipsed all other grammarians, first, because he was the first grammarian to try to give us a comprehensive सर्ववेदपारिषद, book on grammar. Secondly, it was he who disentangled grammar from other things with which it seems to have been mixed up before his time He laid down that grammar had nothing to do with how a word gives a particular meaning, because as to the meaning, it is the usage among the S'istas that determines it and not grammar.* A second change which Panini effected was to do away with the कालाधिकार, which was to be found in earlier grammatical works and adopt a new arrangement,† and the most ingenious part of this new arrangement is the division of the Astd by means of S. VIII. ii. 1. (पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्) into the सपादसप्ताध्यायी and the त्रिपादी

---

* Vide S. I ii. 56 (प्रधानप्रत्ययार्थ०) and the Kasika thereon.

† पाणिनोपज्ञमकालकं व्याकरणम् ।

Candravritti II 2. 68.

उपज्ञाते च । IV. iii. 115

Kasika —पाणिनिनोपज्ञातमकालकं व्याकरणम् ।

Cf also. न वै कालाधिकारोऽस्ति । Bhasya on S परोक्षे लिट् III. ii 115

PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ

CHAPTER XI

PRINCIPLES OF ANALYSIS OF THE ASTD

Every sutra in the Astd is *prima facie* to be considered to have formed part of the Basic Book of Sutras unless :

It can be shown to have been incorporated into the Astd by Panini from the work of another school by the fact that it contravenes the Paribhāṣās found in the Astd

or

It can be shown to have been framed by Panini himself and added to the Basic Book of Sutras by means of the three tests of the Mandūkapluti the चानुकृष्टस्योत्तरत्राननुवृत्ति, and the purposeless Yoga vibhāga

(Vide p 114)

The above are the principles that should guide us broadly speaking in our analysis of the Astd. But it should be remembered that every sutra should be considered independently and with respect to its context. Only after that can we definitely say whether it was part of the Basic Book of Sutras or an addition by Panini to it in building up his सर्ववेदपारिषद शास्त्रम्

CHAPTER XII.

ANALYSIS OF III. i

प्रत्ययः । 1.

परश्च । 2.

Kasika—चकारः पुनरस्यैव समुच्चयार्थः । तेनोणादिषु परत्वं न विहन्यते ॥

आद्युदात्तश्च । 3

अनुदात्तौ सुप्पितौ । 4

गुप्तिज्किद्भ्यः सन् । 5

मान्बधदान्शान्भ्यो दीर्घश्चाभ्यासस्य । 6

धातोः कर्मणः समानकर्तृकादिच्छायां वा । 7.

सुप आत्मनः क्यच् । 8.

काम्यच्च । 9

उपमानादाचारे । 10.

Note the पञ्चमी in all the sutras from 5 to 10 for the प्रत्ययविधि *Cf* also तुदादिभ्यः शः, तनादिकृञ्भ्य उः, क्र्यादिभ्यः श्ना, etc That the proper vibhakti for the प्रत्ययविधि is the पञ्चमी *is clear* from S यस्मात् प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्ययेऽङ्गम्. We have emphasised on this point here, because we shall later come across some sutras, which have a षष्ठी for the प्रत्ययविधि It is evident that they were incorporated by Panini into the Astd *from* grammatical works belonging to schools other than his own. The proper *function of the* षष्ठी *is given in the Bhasya on* S I. i. 1. षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्यादेशा उच्यन्ते ॥ आगमा अपि षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्योच्यन्ते । द्वितीय च I. Bhasya on III. i. 21, says : *षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टं विकारागमयुक्तं* भवति । पञ्चमीनिर्दिष्टाच्च प्रत्ययो विधीयते ।-

Sutras 8 to 10. We have shown above (pp. 67–73) that S. 'काम्यच्च' is a later insertion in between SS. 8 and 9 It is an addition by Panini.

उपमानादाचारे । 10.

कर्तुः क्यङ् सलोपश्च । 11.

'च' not अनुकृष्यर्थं. 'अन्वाचयशिष्टः सलोपः'. भाष्यम्.

भृशादिभ्यो भुव्यच्वेर्लोपश्च हलः ॥ 12.

'च' not अनुकृष्यर्थं. 'अन्वाचयशिष्टो हलो लोपः'. भाष्यम्

लोहितादिडाज्भ्यः क्यष् । 13.

कष्टाय क्रमणे । 14.

Sutra 13 is highly suspicious. Its position is anomalous, because in the following sutra viz. S 14, there is the क्यङनुवृत्ति and not क्यषनुवृत्ति But क्यङ् ought to retire at S. 13, just as क्यच् retires at S. 11 This shows that S. 13, is a later insertion. In the Basic Book of Sutras, S. 14 came immediately after S. 12. The sutra लोहिता° seems to have been borrowed by Panini from another system and inserted in between the sutras 12 and 14.

Another thing to note about this sutra is that, as shown by Patanjali (p. 105), both the इत्s in क्यष्, viz. क् and ष् are useless in the Paninian system. This shows that the sutra was borrowed by Panini from a system where both क् and ष् had some meaning.

सत्यापपाशरूपवीणातूलश्लोकसेनालोमत्वचवर्मवर्णचूर्णचुरादिभ्यो णिच् 125

1. From the sutra it is evident that 'वर्ण' and 'चूर्ण' were not to be found in the चुरादिगण. Now, both of them are found in it

2. Why are the चुरादि roots mentioned along with प्रातिपदिकs like रूप, वीणा, तूल etc, in one and the same sutra? Is it that the author of the sutra thought that the चुरादिs were more of प्रातिपदिकs than of धातुs? It should be noted that Yāska regards the चुरादिs as धातुs.

ऋतेरीयङ् । 29.

It should be noted here that ऋति is a sautra root, not mentioned in the Dhātupātha. The sutra does not contravene any Paribhāṣā found in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Therefore this sutra is framed by Panini himself and is later than the Dhātupātha.

कमेर्णिङ् । 30.

Root कमु is according to the Dh. P. a भ्वादि. Therefore it would take शप् according to the Dh. P. The author of the Astd says that root कमु takes णिङ् and not शप्, therefore this sutra is post-Dh. P. This sutra is an addition by Panini to the Basic Book of Sutras.

कास्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि । 35

इजादेश्च गुरुमतोऽनृच्छः । 36.

दयायासश्च । 37.

1. By the च in S 36, आम् is inducted into it from S. 35 But 'आम्' proceeds to S. 37. Here the Paribhāṣā 'चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र' is broken.

2 Now let us consider the Yogavibhāga between S. 36 and S 37. Sutra 36 is a general rule, sutra 37 mentions three particular roots which take आम्, thus S. 36 is a general rule whereas S 37 is a particular rule There'fore the Yogavibhāga between the two can be attributed to that fact Why is there Yogavibhāga between S 35 and S 36. ? The portion 'प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि' of S 35 is a general rule, S 36 also is a general rule, therefore there is Yogavibhāga between them Now let us see why there is Yogavibhāga between S. 35 and S 37. It may be said that the portion 'प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि', of S. 35, is a general rule, and S. दयायासश्च a particular rule therefore there is Yogavibhāga. But the word कास्, in S. 55 is to be noted If root कास् can be mentioned in S. 35, there is no reason why

the three roots दय, अय, and आस् should not also be put in S. 35 along with कास्, thus :— दयायास्कास्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि. If it was desired to seperate the general and the particular rules, then the author of the sutras ought to have written:—

प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि ।

इजादेश्च गुरुमतोऽनृच्छः ।

दयायास्कासश्च ।

There is no reason why कास् should be put in S. 35 and why दय, अय and आस् should be put in S. 37.

Our explanation of all the facts is that the Basic Book of Sutras contained only S 35 and S. 36 And as both of these are general rules having a broad application they were given seperately in two sutras. Now there remained only the root कास्. The author of the Basic Book of Sutras did not think it proper to allot one whole sutra for the one root कास्. Therefore he put it in S. 35, along with the general rule प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि; thus giving us the sutra 'कास्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि' Panini found that the three roots दय, अय, and आस् also take आम् Therefore he framed S. दयायासश्च and added it as the third sutra.

Cf. Candra'—

अनेकाचो लिट आम्कृभ्वस्तिलिट् धातु ।

इजादेर्गुरुमतोऽनृच्छोर्णो ।

कासयदयास ॥

उषविदजागृभ्योऽन्यतरस्याम् । 38.

भाष्यम्—भारद्वाजीया पठन्ति 'विदेराम् कित्त्वनिपातनाद्वा अगुणत्वम् ।

Is the sutra borrowed from Bhāradvāja?

भीह्रीभृहुवां श्लुवच्च । 39

'पञ्चमीनिर्दिष्टाच्च प्रत्ययो विधीयते । Patanjali on S. III. 1. 1. But here षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टात्प्रत्ययो विधीयते. ∴ The sutra borrowed by Panini from another system.

विभाषा घेट्धयोः । 49.

षष्ठी used for प्रत्ययविधि. ∴ Borrowed from another system *Note that Candra changes the षष्ठी into पञ्चमीः— 'घेधेट्धो' I. i. 69.*

अस्यतिवक्तिख्यातिभ्योऽङ् । 52.

लिपिसिचिह्वश्च । 53.

Kasika— पृथग्योग उत्तरार्थः ।

पुषादिद्युताद्य्लृदितः परस्मैपदेषु । 55.

सर्तिशास्त्यर्तिभ्यश्च । 56.

Kasika — पृथग्योगकरणमात्मनेपदार्थम् । समरन्त । चकारः परस्मैपदेष्विरयनुकर्षणार्थः । तच्चोत्तरत्रोपयोगं यास्यति ।

1. पृथग्योगकरणमात्मनेपदार्थम् । समरन्त । Now ऋ occurs twice in the Dh P.; once as भ्वा. प अ., and a second time as जु. प. अ. So ऋ is not आत्मनेपद at all. The Nyāsa says, सम्पूर्वादर्तेः समो (I. iii. 29) गम्यादिनात्मनेपदम्. Now let us turn to Kās'ikā I. iii. 29 There we read:—

समोगम्यृच्छिप्रच्छिस्वरत्यर्तिश्रुविदिभ्यः ।

But the Kās'ika has here as in some other places, meddled with the text of the sutra The परम्परागत text of the sutra is the one given by the Siddhānta Kaumudī समोगम्यृच्छिभ्याम् ।.

2 "चकारः परस्मैपदेष्विरयनुकर्षणार्थः । तच्चोत्तरत्रोपयोगं यास्यति". But 'चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र'.

We think that the sutra (56) is of Panini's authorship and has been added by him.

इरितो वा । 57.

जृस्तम्भुम्रुचुम्लुचुग्रुचुग्लुचुग्लुञ्चुश्विभ्यश्च । 58.

Sutra 58 added by Panini. Vide our remarks on this sutra in Chapter II. pp. 15-16.

दिवादिभ्यः श्यन् । 69

वा भ्राशभ्लाशभ्रमुक्रमुक्लमुत्रसित्रुटिलषः ॥ 70.

Sutra 70, an addition by Panini Vide p 16. et seq.

स्वादिभ्यः श्नुः । 73.

श्रुवः शृ च । 74.

Nyasa:— श्रु श्रवण इति भ्वादौ पठ्यते । ततः शपि प्राप्ते श्नुर्विधीयते ।

Sutra 74 added by Panini. *Cf* our remarks on 'धिन्विकृण्व्योर च' on pp. 18-19.

अशोऽन्यतरस्याम् । 75.

Added by Panini. Remarks same as on S वा भ्राशभ्लाशभ्रमु°, *mutatis mutandis*. Vide pp. 16 17

तनादिकृञ्भ्य उः । 79

The text of the sutra indicates that originally 'कृञ्' was not among the तनादिs. Kṣīrasvāmin has a 'कृञ्' among the स्वादिs.

धिन्विकृण्व्योर च । 80.

Addition by Panini Vide pp. 18 19.

स्तम्भुस्तुम्भुस्कम्भुस्कुम्भुस्कुञ्भ्यः श्नुश्च । 82.

'आयाश्चत्वारो धातवः सौत्राः' (Kās'ikā) Vide our remarks on the sautra roots in Chapter II (pp. 19-21) Remarks similar to those made on S. वा भ्राशभ्लाशभ्रमु° on pp. 16 et seq apply to this sutra also. The sutra (82) is an addition by Panini.

न दुहस्नुनमां यक्चिणौ । 89.

(1) भाष्यम् :— भारद्वाजीयाः पठन्ति यक्चिणोः प्रतिषेधे णिश्रन्थिग्रन्थिब्रूञात्मनेपदाकर्मकाणामुपसंख्यानमिति ॥

(2) 'पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी' in 'दुहस्नुनमाम्'.

(3) "दुहस्नोर्यक् प्रतिषिध्यते । चिण् दुहेर्वेति पूर्वमेव विभाषितः ।" Kās'ikā. "दुहस्नोर्यक एव निषेधः । चिण् तु विकल्पेनेष्यते" Siddhānta Kaumudī. But this contravenes the rule 'विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्'.

The sutra borrowed by Panini from another system ; pro bably from *Bhāradvāja. If Panini himself had written this rule, he would have written:—*

न दुहो यक् ।

स्नुनमश्रिण् च ॥.

कुपिरजोः प्राचां श्यन् परस्मैपदं च । 90.

कुपिरजोः— पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी । ∴ Borrowed by Panini from another system. This conclusion supported by 'प्राचाम्'.

Candra has 'कुपिरज आप्ये'.

कृत्याः । 95. Siddhānta Kaumudī.

कृत्याः प्राङ्ण्वुलः । 95. Kās'ikā.

अचो यत् । 97.

पोरदुपधात् । 98. [यत्]

शकिसहोश्च । 99 [यत्]

गदमदचरयमश्चानुपसर्गे ॥ 100. [यत्]

1. Note that 'यत्' inducted into S. 99 with a 'च' proceeds to S. 100. Contravenes 'चानुकृष्टं नोत्तरत्र'. ∴ Either S. 99 or S. 100 an addition.

2. 'शकिसहोः'—पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी. ∴ Incorporated by Panini from another system.

Therefore we may conclude that the Basic Book of Sutras had only:—

अचो यत् ।
पोरदुपधात् ।
गदमदचरयमश्चानुपसर्गे ।

and that Panini added "शकिसहोश्च" from another system. He did not add it after S. गदमद०, because 'अनुपसर्गे' would have been 'अनुवृत्त' into it.

गदमदचरयमश्चानुपसर्गे । 100.

अवद्यपण्यवर्या गर्ह्यपणितव्यानिरोधेषु । 101.
वह्यं करणम् । 102.
अर्यः स्वामिवैश्ययोः । 103.
उपसर्या काल्या प्रजने । 104.
अजर्यं संगतम् । 105

वदः सुपि क्यप् च । 106.

Kasika — अनुपसर्गे इति वर्तते ।

Sutras 101–105 are Nipātana sūtras. The intimate connection between S. 100 and S 106 is clear from the Kās'ikā. SS 101–5 seem to be insertions by Panini.

वदः सुपि क्यप् च । 106.
Kasika ...... क्यप् प्रत्ययो भवति चकाराद्यच् ।
भुवो भावे । 107.
Kasika :— भवतेः.. ...क्यप् प्रत्ययो भवति । यत्तु नानुवर्तते ।
Nyasa: – यत्तु नानुवर्तत इति । पूर्वसूत्रे चानुकृष्टत्वात् ॥
एतिस्तुशास्वृदृजुषः क्यप् । 109
ऋदुपधाच्चाक्लृपिचृतेः । 110.

The 'च' in S. 110 shows that the क्यप् adhikāra ends with S 110. SS. 111 to 123 seem to be additions Of these S. 120, 'विभाषा कृवृषोः,' has a पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी. ∴ The sutra is borrowed by Panini from another system. It should be noted that the Yogavibhāga between SS. 113 (मृजेर्विभाषा) and S. 120 (विभाषा कृवृषोः) is purposeless.

It should also be noted that SS. 118-120 come abruptly into the middle of Nipātanas. The 'च' in S. 'युग्यं च पत्रे' seems to indicate that the क्यप् Nipātanas are finished there This is borne out by the fact that the next Nipātana is of ण्यत् (vide Kās'ikā on S. 122, अमावस्यदन्यतरस्याम्).

ऋहलोर्ण्यत् । 124

ओगावश्यके । 125 [ण्यत्]

आसुयुवपिरपिलपित्रपिचमश्च । 126. [ण्यत्]

The 'च' in S. 126 shows that the Anuvrtti, of ण्यत् is finished with S. 126. In S. 124 ऋहलोर्ण्यत्, there is "पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी"* (Kās'ikā) ∴ S. 124, borrowed from another system. SS. 125 and 126 seem to be likewise borrowals, because SS. 124-126 are one group of sutras all about ण्यत्.

आनाय्योऽनित्ये । 127.

The Nipātana sutras begin from here and end at

चित्याग्निचित्ये च । 132.

The 'च' shows that the Nipātanas end here.

अनुपसर्गाल्लिम्पविन्दधारिपारिवेद्युदेजिचेतिसातिसाहिभ्यश्च । 138.

The sutra contains 'साति', a sautra root. ∴ *The sutra is* post-D. P. The sutra is framed by Panini and added to the Basic Book of Sutras.

ददातिदधात्योर्विभाषा । 139.

पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी. ∴ The sutra borrowed from another system by Panini and added.

ज्वलितिकसन्तेभ्यो णः ।140.

श्याद्व्यधास्रुसंस्र्वतीणवसावहृलिहश्लिषश्वसश्च । 141.

The 'च' marks the end of the 'णविधि'. ∴ *The next sutra* is an addition. This is supported by the fact that in

दुन्योरनुपसर्गे । 142 [णः]

we have a 'पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी', which shows that the sutra is borrowed by Panini from another system.

आशिषि च । 150.



इति तृतीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः

॥ इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥

* पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठीति ।......प्रत्ययविधौ हि परश्चेति (III. 1. 2.) सम्बन्धात् पञ्चम्या भाव्यम् ॥ Nyāsa.